MARCH 1948. PRICE 1s. 3d. NET.

The Expository Times

FOUNDED IN 1889 BY
JAMES HASTINGS, D.D.

EDITORS
A. W. HASTINGS, M.A.
Rev. E. HASTINGS, M.A.

HOLBROOK LIBRARY PACIFIC SCHOOL OF RELIGION

Contents

PAGE

I. NOTES OF RECENT EXPOSITION—Canon Demant on Our Culture—Is Christianity a Danger to Civilization?—The Theology of Grace and the Theology of Man's Natural Life—A Study of the Atonement by Professor Relton—Cross and Altar 141

II. LITERATURE 143

III. UNSOLVED NEW TESTAMENT PROBLEMS: THE MESSIANIC SECRET IN MARK. By Principal Vincent Taylor, D.D., Wesley College, Headingley, Leeds 146

IV. THE PARABLE OF THE GOOD SAMARITAN. By Dr. John Bowman, The University, Leeds 151

V. IN THE STUDY—
1. Virginibus Puerisque 153
2. The Christian Year 154

VI. THE PRIMITIVE FORM OF CHRISTIAN BAPTISM. By the Reverend H. V. Martin, M.A., B.D., Ph.D., Anantapur, South India 160

VII. RECENT FOREIGN THEOLOGY. By Professor H. H. Rowley, D.D., Manchester . . 164

VIII. CONTRIBUTIONS AND COMMENTS—
1. The Imperatival Participle. By the Reverend C. K. Barrett, M.A., Durham . . 165
2. The Marcan Parable of the Child in the Midst. By the Reverend T. F. Glasson, M.A., D.D., Windsor, and the Reverend E. L. Wenger, Baptist Mission, Barisal, East Bengal 166

IX. ENTRE NOUS—A Jesuit Poet 167

VOLUME LIX. No. 6

38 GEORGE ST. : T. & T. CLARK : EDINBURGH
EDITORIAL AND ADVERTISING OFFICES, KING'S GATE, ABERDEEN

VIEWPOINTS

A new series of books dealing with contemporary issues of thought and life

The aim of Viewpoints books is to set readers thinking. The questions discussed are varied and of wide interest, and the authors are authorities on their subject.

The first six titles:

DOES CHRISTIANITY MAKE SENSE? by F. A. Cockin
BODY, MIND AND SPIRIT by Philip Leon
SCRUTINY OF MARXISM by J. M. Cameron
WHAT IS THE BIBLE? by S. H. Hooke
THE PROBLEM OF EVIL by J. S. Whale
ASTROLOGY AND PREDICTION by C. F. Rogers

Subjects to be dealt with will include The Films, The English Heritage, The Meaning of History, The Significance of Jesus, Reasonable Living, etc.

Viewpoints are attractively produced with stiff boards and coloured covers and jackets.

2s 6d net each

SCM PRESS

56 Bloomsbury Street, London, W.C.1

WHATEVER THE YEARS

Ronald Selby Wright

During the war the Rev. Ronald Selby Wright, as Radio Padre, had not only one of the largest wireless audiences, but also was one of the best sellers, and here now for the first time since the war is a new book by him. *6s. net*

AND HERE A RAINBOW

Dr. Leslie F. Church

A sequel to the author's *In the Quietness* and *In the Storm*, and its sturdy optimism will not let its readers rest until they, too, have found the rainbow in the clouds. *7s. 6d. net*

THE CREED OF A CHRISTIAN

(Six Broadcast Talks)

W. M. F. Scott and H. Watkin-Jones

In his Foreword Eric Saxon writes: 'What is abundantly clear is that there is a widespread interest in Christian doctrine, and that people are prepared to think out together the meaning of the Creed of a Christian.' *3s. 6d. net*

EPWORTH PRESS

25-35 CITY ROAD, LONDON, E.C.1.

LUTTERWORTH

Recent Publications

Pascal and Kierkegaard

A Study in the Strategy of Evangelism

DENZIL PATRICK

A comparison of the conception and execution of their evangelistic tasks which brings out the remarkable consensus between the two men. In an epilogue, the author relates this study to the tasks and methods of evangelism to-day. Vol. I., 15s.; Vol. II., 25s. net.

Eyes of Faith

PAUL S. MINEAR

The author attempts to reveal the perspective within which the biblical message exerted its original power. 15s. net.

The Good News

H. F. WICKINGS

In its early manuscript form, this book was used during 1943–45 in a Japanese internment camp. Here, in an up-to-date translation, and with explanatory notes, is contained the story of what Jesus said and did, and what happened as a result. 7s. 6d. net.

Write for lists:
LUTTERWORTH PRESS
Doran Court, Reigate Road, Redhill, Surrey

THE BEST BOOKS OF A GREAT EXPOSITOR

Dr. G. CAMPBELL MORGAN

THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES 15/-
The greatest expository work on this book, profound yet practical. By post 15/6.

THE CRISES OF THE CHRIST 12/6
A Study of Christ in relation to God and His Purpose and to Man and his Need. By post 13/-.

THE TEACHING OF CHRIST 10/-
Our Lord's Words on God, Himself, the Spirit, Man, Sin, Salvation, etc. By post, 10/6.

THE LETTERS OF OUR LORD 6/-
A First-Century Message to Twentieth-Century Christians (Rev. 2 and 3). By post, 6/6.

THE TRIUMPHS OF FAITH 5/-
The Basic Principle of Life, its Nature, Principles and Illustrations (Heb. 11). By post 5/6.

THE LIFE OF THE CHRISTIAN 4/6
Its Nature, Sustenance, Expression, Testing, Value, etc., all "in Christ." By post 4/10.

PICKERING & INGLIS LTD.

229 Bothwell Street, Glasgow, C.2

29 Ludgate Hill, London, E.C.4

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

A SECOND series of Edward Alleyn Lectures has been published under the title *Our Culture : Its Christian Roots and Present Crisis*.[1] Canon V. A. DEMANT, as editor, got together a strong team of lecturers consisting of Professor H. A. Hodges, Christopher Dawson, Dorothy Sayers, and Maurice B. Reckitt, while he himself delivered the opening and closing lectures. For penetrating insight and illuminating generalization these lectures are hard to beat. Unlike many present-day volumes this one is well worth its modest price. From dozens of points that merit the consideration of readers of these columns we choose but one. What is meant by saying that we live in a post-Christian age ?

In his closing lecture Dr. DEMANT faces the question whether Christianity is a danger to civilization. Ecclesiastical apologists usually maintain that European culture was formed by Christianity. Others, however, like Gibbon and Nietzsche, have blamed Christianity for disintegrating the natural culture of European man. It cannot be denied that Christianity intensified something that was already present in classical culture—the individualizing tendency which sets man over against the rest of reality. At the same time Christianity impressed upon man, as a being whom God had called in Christ, a sense of his utterly dependent participation in the cosmic whole. In recent centuries, however, the sense of man's individuality has been heightened, but the divine-human context of it and the cosmic spiritual scheme that Christianity taught have been abandoned. Thus, something that Christianity had made possible now acquired an independent status, and man's inner being and the universe stood confronting one another without any deep awareness that both inner and outer world had a common source and dependence in the living God.

The present century has seen a revolt in the name of social solidarity against the proud humanism which seeks to emancipate man from his roots in God and in the material world. This revolt is society's attempt to protect itself against dissolution ; but it involves a retreat not to a Christian but to a pre-Christian situation, and its end is the mass-man. Thus the outcome of man's departure from God's order is, to use the words of Dr. John A. Mackay in his recent Croall Lectures, the modern ' anonymity and banality.'

Modern man is torn between the opposite pulls of his social situation and his moral aims, so that, for example, while he aims at freedom and material security for himself and his fellows, in fact freedom is more and more curtailed, while good food, clothes, and houses are becoming too expensive in a society where the production of technical and State equipment gets ever higher priority. Man, who has greater control over things than ever, is nevertheless carried along by a process he cannot control. His technical civilization is providing more powerful means to do things and less opportunity for doing anything satisfying for its own sake.

Christian history has been marked throughout by the tension of the two loyalties to God and to the earthly community ; but this tension no longer exists when religion has so lost its specific nature that loyalty to God becomes part of loyalty to the earthly community. Society needs a religious foundation for its culture : hence various forms of the deification of society itself. Communism, Fascism, and National Socialism are all examples of attempts to make society its own church, and this is not due merely to dictatorial policy. Here again society is trying to protect itself against disintegration, but in so doing it is not returning to a Christian duality, so to call it, of Church and State, but to the pre-Christian situation where there was no tension between society and religion. Dr. DEMANT sees the same urge towards a ' societal ' religion in the democracies, too. He remarks how the calendar of the Christian year is being invaded by society's own commemorations, and he quotes as only slightly exaggerated Santayana's dictum, ' All modern religion is but social reform, whatever its nominal

[1] S.P.C.K. ; 5s. net.

creed.' Such a religion may be a more serious menace to the Christian faith than definite unbelief. It represents an undogmatic, unsupernatural, unevangelical religion: it attaches no real meaning to sin, redemption, and sanctification, but it expresses an immanentist pelagian religion in the idiom of Christianity. Yet, says Dr. DEMANT, our attitude to this development should be understandingly sympathetic as well as critical. Spiritually dangerous forces always fasten on real human problems. These modern religions that have their roots in the immanent urges of society for cohesion and not in the Word of God to men in the Body of Christ are the outcome of a real need of the modern soul.

Here, then, is what is meant by saying that we are now in a post-Christian age. It is an age whose problems would not have the character they have nor be as acute as they are, were it not for the dispositions in regard to man's relation to the world formed by, but now separated from, the Christian world-view. If the world had remained pagan it would not have some of its present desperate tensions. In that sense Christianity is a dangerous religion. Bits of it taken out of their total context do have a disintegrating effect.

What is the remedy? It is certainly not mere exhortation to good will. Moral advice will not cure a spiritual malady. Dr. DEMANT points the way for the Church thus: 'The theology of Grace and the theology of man's natural life must both be recovered without entirely separating them or merging them in one another.' If the first is not recovered Christians will be content merely to sweeten the social drift and the Church will become an appendage of social movements. If the second is not recovered and Christians proclaim a purely apocalyptic salvation, then society will find in some form of paganism or unscriptural idealism the faith to inspire its politics.

Professor H. Maurice RELTON, D.D., of King's College, London, well known for his expositions of traditional theology, has published in the 'New World Outlook' series a short but comprehensive study of the Atonement—*Cross and Altar*.[1] There is a Foreword by Canon E. S. Abbott, the present Dean of King's College, who remarks on the book's 'close-knit unity of Biblical theology with material for the devotional and spiritual life.'

[1] Skeffington; 8s. 6d. net.

The characteristic feature of the book is its endeavour to show that in a true theory of the Atonement Cross and Altar should both find a place. In his exposition Professor RELTON makes much of the point that Cross and Altar are both of them 'numinous.' It is to the mystery of the Atonement, he adds, that they owe their 'numinous' character. The writers on whom he appears to be most dependent in his endeavour to outline a theory of the Atonement centred in the Cross and the Altar are Horace Bushnell and (as an exponent of Grotius' Restoral Theory) P. Carnegie Simpson.

But let us follow the lines of Professor RELTON'S thought. He is attracted by Bushnell's rejection of the 'moral view' in any of its forms in favour of the theory that there is a timeless element in the Sacrifice at Calvary. There an eternal Cross in the heart of the suffering Love is revealed. In the Crucified, as we see with the eyes of faith, God Himself takes our 'sinning enmity' upon His heart, travailing to recover us to Himself.

From such a standpoint the Cross would be a 'numinous' object, as being the focal point in the temporal world for the expression immanently of a Transcendent Holy God of Love, who must bear through all time in vicarious sacrifice the sins of men. The reality of this is immanently felt and made known to men wherever a material cross entices them to draw near and discover what it means, to touch it at a sensitive point and gain personal experience of its power. The Cross of Christ becomes then no dead material symbol; upon it is revealed a living God. Explain it as we may, the Cross is still 'numinous.' Calvary still speaks and will not be silenced.

If this is true of the Cross, it is equally true (as Professor RELTON goes on to say) of the Altar. In Christian experience the Altar is also 'numinous,' and alive with deepest meaning. There is a continuous testimony to the reality of a Presence, not created by faith, but perceived by faith as already there. Like the Cross, the Altar is a focal point for an expression in terms of time of what goes on in the Heart of God behind the veil; it is an instrument for the immanent expression of the Transcendent Reality.

How are we to distinguish the experiences that are expressed and embodied in Cross and Altar respectively? The distinction might be put thus. The Cross is the revelation in time that a free forgiveness is available for us; the Altar, that we are bidden to accept it. Or in the language of technical theology, the Cross mediates for us

justification by faith; the Altar mediates for us equally in experience sanctification in Christ. (Some denominations would not use the phrase, 'Altar,' and others would not accept the implications of this use of the phrases, 'justification' and 'sanctification,' the relationship between the two being a matter of high debate, but Professor RELTON would apparently be quite satisfied if the truths he would affirm were to be interpreted 'in a larger context' within the varieties of religious experience of other denominations than the Church of England.)

'The two great doctrines of justification by faith and sanctification in Christ are two moments in a lived experience of the activity of God to usward in an act of redeeming Love. If we are to form a theory of the Atonement which is to ring true to Christian experience, it must find room for both these moments. It must embrace all the experience which we associate with the Cross as a "numinous" object and all the experience which we associate with the Altar as an equally "numinous" object. The Cross brings home to the soul the experience of forgiveness through the sacrifice once offered; the Altar brings home to the soul the actuality of that forgiveness as this is experienced in its consequences, namely, our reception of the benefits of our restored relationship with God in Christ. Thus the Altar is really the culminating experience of the reality of the evangelical Good News.'

It may be that here are the elements of a sound theory of the Atonement. If so, Professor RELTON appears to be right in saying that there is no escaping the idea of substitution as an element in the theory. Which leads him to proceed in his exposition with Grotius, as presented by P. Carnegie Simpson, and to describe the Agony and the Cross as the supreme meeting of human sin and the moral order which condemns sin—'a meeting which should take place in my guilty heart but which took place in His instead.'

Were we to follow Professor RELTON further, we should notice how he argues that there can be no repetition of the Gethsemane and Calvary experience by which Christ paid the debt of sin in an agony of dereliction, but that there is a possible repetition of the Calvary sacrifice. It is to be seen and realized in His perpetual bearing in Himself of our diseases, our sicknesses, our sins; giving Himself without measure as we receive into ourselves the gift of life and the medicine of immortality. But for the due appreciation of such thoughts, and the final suggestions of the writer towards a theory, we must refer our readers to the book itself. It is a small book, but it covers much ground.

Literature.

CHRISTIAN APOLOGETICS.

IT has always been difficult to draw a line of demarcation between general religious apologetics and Christian apologetics, as indeed between Christian apologetics and Christian dogmatics. But in his latest book—*Christian Apologetics* (S.C.M.; 10s. 6d. net)—Canon Alan Richardson, B.D., of Durham, makes so determined an effort to do so that the book has a good chance, with its merits which are great, of being recognized as a text-book on its special subject.

Just as (unlike so many writers on Christian apologetics) he refrains from occupying in any sense the field of Christian dogmatics, so (again unlike so many writers on Christian apologetics) he refrains from traversing the ground of natural theology or metaphysics of religion. On this latter point his own words may be usefully quoted: 'General religious apologetics deals with such matters as the defence of the religious or theistic view of the world, the arguments for the existence of God, the answer to the problem of evil, the counter-attack upon atheistic or agnostic views, and so on; it is akin to what used to be called "natural theology" and to what is nowadays sometimes called philosophy of religion. It endeavours to treat of these matters without the help of a special revelation.' So far, general religious apologetics; and now, Christian apologetics: 'Christian apologetics, in the narrower sense which that expression carries when it is used precisely, is concerned with the implications of the Christian revelation for the rational understanding of the world and of our existence in it. It seeks to show that revelation, as Christians understand it, is not merely compatible with the exercise of reason, but is actually a help and guide to the human reason in its attempt to understand; and, moreover, that revelation is not a figment of the imagination of Christians, but that it is a category based on observable facts and recognizable experiences, when they are correctly interpreted.'

With Christian apologetics thus narrowly and precisely defined, Canon Richardson does not need to do more than touch upon questions of general religious apologetics; and as for Christian dogmatics, he does not need to enter upon its questions at all. Conceiving of apologetics as related to apology as homiletics is to preaching,

he makes no attempt to state Christianity 'defensively' (A. B. Bruce) or 'persuasively' (A. E. Garvie), but concentrates on the background as it were of Christian thought. General and special revelation, the traditional arguments from miracle and prophecy, the inspiration and authority of the Bible, the relationship between faith and reason—these are the subjects he would comprise under Christian apologetics. At the same time he would have his readers acquainted with modern discussions that bear upon our manner of approach to those subjects; in particular, as to the nature of scientific truth (for theology is to be conceived as an empirical science), the meaning of ideology (which Christian faith and worship transcend), the character of historical thinking (Christianity being an historical faith).

Within the limits thus marked out for himself Canon Richardson moves with masterly ease. He is in close touch with the currents of modern thought, and he takes a modern view of the nature of revelation. For him revelation is not only the central theme of Christian apologetics, but the category by which an empirical theology stands or falls. Revelation is not, however, given to us in the form of written propositions. Its essence, as W. Temple contended, is 'intercourse of mind and event, not the communication of doctrine distilled from that intercourse.' Only from such a view of revelation may Canon Richardson speak of the 'myths' of Creation and the Fall, of the Day of the Lord, the Second Coming, the Judgment.

A commendable feature of the book is its references to great masters of Christian thought—a St. Augustine, a St. Thomas, a Luther, a Calvin, and—shall we say?—a Karl Barth. If its greatest deference is to the first-named, who should cavil?

W. FULTON.

ANGLO-CATHOLICISM.

We have been living through the centenary of the crisis of the Tractarian Movement from which Anglo-Catholicism in its current connotation took its rise. The story has often been told, and the main features of the lives and contributions of its leaders have often been depicted. In the case of a Movement, however, which was of such vital importance for the future of the Anglican Church, and which from its inception to the present day has aroused such controversy, there will be perhaps permanent room and even need for re-statement and re-evaluation.

Some years ago the Rev. Desmond Morse-Boycott issued 'The Secret Story of the Oxford Movement,' a book which awoke great interest, and was very favourably received. He has incorporated the bones of it, clothed in new flesh and with some emendation, in a large work—*They Shine Like Stars* (Skeffington; 21s. net). The title is not very happy, being so non-significant; the sub-title, 'The Story of the Great Church Revival,' is vastly better. The 'shining stars,' of course, are the leaders.

The author does not merely repeat what has elsewhere been adequately said. His aim is to make characters like Newman, Keble, Froude, and others 'live' before the reader; and he has been at immense pains to collect material which is not familiar. Further, he has embellished the book with a galaxy of unfamiliar portraits. He writes in crisp, lucid style and with an eye to the general reader. What is particularly valuable is his carrying on of the story to the present day.

The author's own theological views will not, of course, command assent outside Anglo-Catholic circles. Many will find that his attempt to find a basis in The Book of Common Prayer for the practice of invocation of the Saints, especially the Blessed Virgin, is very curious, and however ingenious, far from convincing. Yet we may all be grateful for a book so well written, so well illustrated, and based on such wide and patient research, which deals with a Movement to which churches outside the Anglican pale have owed so much.

W. D. NIVEN.

Jesus and Woman, by Lady Hosie (Hodder & Stoughton; 8s. 6d. net), is a study of the Four Gospels 'with special reference to the attitude of the man, Jesus Christ, towards women.' It is extraordinarily well done. The writer has made a close and scholarly study of the Gospels, and, though her theme is congenial, she exaggerates nothing. Few people will have realized, until they read this book, what a large place women hold in the Gospel narrative. Indeed, when you lay the book down, you feel you have received an impression that there is nothing else in the Gospels! Lady Hosie stretches her net wide, and the result is that in her book there are two distinct sources of interest. One, of course, is the discovery that women occupy a large part of the canvas. The other is, unexpectedly, a constant flow of information about the Gospel facts and the Gospel narrative for its own sake. In its own way, you have here a minor Life of Jesus and a study of the Gospel picture of Him. Lady Hosie does not give much attention to the modern problems concerning the status of women. But she has given us the basal facts in a narrative that is always fresh and interesting.

In *Christ is Alive!* (Lutterworth Press; 7s. 6d. net) Mr. G. R. Beasley Murray presents a competent and brightly written review of the evidence for the Resurrection and the obstacles in the way of critical attempts to explain it away, and gives a sound estimate of its importance from the point of view of enlightened evangelical theology. He objects to Brunner's dictum that 'Easter is not a historical event, it is revelation,' and—one supposes in the light of the atom bomb—makes approving reference to Miss Dorothy Sayers' suggestion that the molecular rearrangement required by the physical resurrection gave rise to electric disturbances felt as an earthquake.

This is quite a good and interesting book, but like others of its kind it is hardly on the plane of

Denney's noble treatment of the theme to much the same effect which he gave in fifty pages of his 'Jesus and the Gospel.'

The Good News (Lutterworth Press; 7s. 6d. net), by Mr. H. F. Wickings, is the story of Jesus Christ from the Gospels and the Acts in a modern translation with explanatory notes. It is a 'harmony,' but not a complete 'harmony'; not all the material in the Four Gospels is included. There has been a process of selection, and the aim throughout is brevity and simplicity. The result is a very readable and consecutive presentation of the traditional story. On the left side of the pages is the story itself with the references clearly given, on the right side a very helpful commentary. Altogether a useful and attractive book by a competent and reliable author, and we commend it to the notice of teachers and preachers. It is interesting to note that in its early manuscript form the book was used during 1943–45 in a Japanese internment camp in the Far East.

To the Hebrews, by the Rev. Bede Frost (Mowbray; 6s. 6d. net), is a commentary on the Epistle from the dogmatic and devotional standpoint. The writer explains that he has omitted 'such details and points of controversy as are of interest only to scholars' because they are of little consequence to those who desire to understand the writer's message to those whom he addresses. Such commentaries, it is to be regretted, are on the increase; it seems to be assumed that the scholars in question are only amusing themselves, and that the original writers can be immediately understood by any intelligent reader. The result, as in the present commentary, is only to be expected. The commentator finds in the Epistle a mirror in which he sees his own theology and even his ecclesiastical theories. Mr. Frost rightly emphasizes the teaching on the one great Sacrifice offered by Christ, and in this lies the value of the commentary. But he sees much more. He is quite sure that the Eucharist is meant in the difficult passage, 'We have an altar' (He 13^{10}), and finds it even in 'Not forsaking the assembling of yourselves together' (He 10^{25}). Without the luxury of a discussion, he assumes that the Temple is thought of as still standing, and holds that the letter was written for Jewish Christians in Jerusalem! He even finds room for an exposition of the Catholic conception of Christian priesthood. The commentary will be comforting to the elect, but irritating to the open-minded.

A group of Roman Catholic scholars mostly in America are engaged in an excellent enterprise—the publication of translations of ancient Christian writers. The Epistles of Clement and Ignatius; the 'Catechetical Instructions,' and 'Faith, Hope and Charity' of Augustine were the first three, and now the fourth has been issued—*Julianus Pomerius: The Contemplative Life* (Newman Bookshop, Westminster, Maryland; $2.50). The translation with annotations is by Sister Mary Josephine Suelzer, Ph.D., and is an admirable piece of work.

Little is known of the life of Pomerius save that towards the end of the fifth century he was teaching rhetoric at Arles, one of his pupils being the noteworthy Caesarius, Bishop and Saint of Arles. And this work of his, *De Vita Contemplativa,* was for long falsely accredited to Prosper of Aquitaine. The book, even so, was largely forgotten, and difficult to procure even in the best libraries, and no English translation has been available till now. The work is one of the earliest on Pastoral Theology in the West. It was written at a time of decadence in the Church and chaos in the State to recall the clergy to the height of their high calling. Many things are well and wisely said for ministers of all times. It is a real gain to have this work in English speech, and have it with such scholarly introduction and comment.

The Infallible Word (Presbyterian Guardian Publishing Corporation, Philadelphia; $2.50) is a Symposium by the Members of the Faculty of Westminster Theological Seminary. This Seminary was established in 1929 to carry on the tradition of loyalty to the Bible and the Reformed Faith which, as is here said, was the distinguishing mark of Princeton Theological Seminary until its reorganization in that year. We are not sure that Princeton would like this way of putting it, but it appears quite probable that Princeton would not be inclined to sponsor such a volume as this, which would affirm in the modern world the historic doctrine that the Bible is the infallible Word of God. Not that the writers are infected with obscurantism. On the contrary, they are well aware of the trends of thought in our age. But the modern world tends to be impatient of discussions on the lines of seventeenth-century confessional orthodoxy. None the less there is much of both historical and positive value in this book, and the scope of it readily appears from the chapter headings: The Attestation of Scripture, The Authority of the Old Testament, The Authority of the New Testament, The Transmission of the Scriptures, The Relevancy of Scripture, Scriptural Preaching, Nature and Scripture.

Five Finger Exercises, by the Rev. Hedley Hodkin (S.C.M.; 2s. 6d. net), is a far finer book than the unhappy title suggests. It is written by one who believes in prayer and who can enrich this interesting study of prayer by apt allusion to a large and varied range of devotional literature and to the latest theological scholarship. It is fresh and incisive on every page, and it has as a special excellence that it is constantly finding direction and stimulus and suggestion for prayer in the teaching and example of Christ, and the concrete detail of the Gospel narratives. A book to admire and enjoy and study with profit.

Unsolved New Testament Problems.

The Messianic Secret in Mark.

By Principal Vincent Taylor, D.D., Wesley College, Headingley, Leeds.

Some thirteen years ago I had the honour of introducing and concluding a series of articles under the general title, 'Some Outstanding New Testament Problems.'[1] By the decision of the Editors a new series is now to be written which will treat problems still unsolved. The object is to state and discuss these questions afresh and to make any constructive suggestions which may point the way to their solution. A particularly pleasing feature is the Editors' intention to enlist in the discussion not only those who have pondered these issues for many years, but also younger students who bring fresh minds to the undertaking. In this way it is hoped that many readers will be led to consider afresh critical and exegetical problems, which no one can escape who studies the New Testament closely, in the light of what the several writers have to say. It is desired, too, that further progress may be made in one of the most fascinating of inquiries, the Origins of Christianity. In due course the Editors will give a full list of subjects and contributors. Meantime it falls to my lot to discuss a particularly important and difficult problem, namely, that of the 'Messianic Secret' in Mark.

I.

The problem was set nearly fifty years ago by the publication of *Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien*[2] by Professor W. Wrede of Breslau, a book to which Dr. W. Sanday drew attention in a particularly trenchant discussion in his *Life of Christ in Recent Research*.[3] Many scholars in Germany and Great Britain joined in the discussion of Wrede's startling thesis. Some of the most important, available to English readers, are those of Schweitzer,[4] A. S. Peake,[5] and A. E. J. Rawlinson.[6]

Sanday's attack is devastating, but like the charges of Prince Rupert's cavalry in the Civil War of the seventeenth century, its results are less assured than they appeared at first. In a famous phrase he described the book as 'not only very wrong but also distinctly wrong-headed.' Wrede's style he compared to that of a Prussian official, and he declared: 'He has all the arrogance of a certain kind of common sense.' It was impossible, he justly urged, to exhaust the motives of the actors in events that happened nearly nineteen hundred years ago, and 'nothing is more certain than that we cannot in the least come near exhausting them.' It must be added that Sanday's criticism was supported by solid arguments, which have been generally accepted as proving the utter inadequacy of Wrede's hypothesis in its original form. More effective is Peake's discussion, although alas! it is buried in a pamphlet, which, none the less, is worth its weight in gold. Rawlinson's well-known essay is particularly valuable because it seeks to distinguish points of positive importance from positions which must be rejected. Schweitzer's brilliant discussion is forceful and telling, but it is not disinterested since all the way through Schweitzer is preparing the way for that emphasis on eschatology which is characteristic of his treatment of the Gospels. Sanday's attack consists of sharp and sustained bursts of musketry; Peake's is the remorseless pounding of long-range artillery; Rawlinson's fire is the kind which seeks to force an opponent to find fresh ground; Schweitzer's onslaught is the rattle of machine-guns. The general result was to discredit Wrede's hypothesis in the eyes of British scholars.

It was therefore with surprise that reviewers observed the deference paid to Wrede's work by Professor R. H. Lightfoot in his *History and Interpretation in the Gospels*[7] and his claim that 'its results have been for the most part to the good.' No less strange appeared the favourable references to Wrede's hypothesis by the Form-critics, R. Bultmann[8] and M. Dibelius,[9] although here the suspicion was possible that his conclusions were found useful to critics who thought of the gospel tradition as a mass of disconnected fragments. But most significant of all is the

[1] The Expository Times, xlvi. and xlvii.
[2] 1901, 2nd ed. 1913.
[3] Oxford [1908], 69–76.
[4] *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*, 336–48.
[5] 'The Messiah and the Son of Man,' in *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, VIII. i. [January 1924] 1–32.
[6] *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, 258–62.
[7] [1935], pp. 16–22.
[8] *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition* [1921, 2nd. ed., 1931].
[9] *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums* [1919, 2nd ed. 1933]; Eng. tr., *From Tradition to Gospel*, 223n.

acceptance, with important qualifications, of the idea of the Messianic Secret in two of the most recent and important commentaries on Mark, those of E. Lohmeyer [1] and J. Schniewind,[2] and especially because these commentaries differ so greatly in their attitude to the historical element in Mark. It is characteristic of these later developments that Wrede's hypothesis is not accepted in its original rigour. Thus, Schniewind says in his Introduction that he takes up the phrase 'Messianic Secret' coined by Wrede in an altered sense. He claims that in the miracles, the words, the actions, and the suffering of Jesus, the idea that He is the Messiah appears as a secret, and that this secret stands behind every section of Mark. It belongs to the material as such.[3]

II.

It will be useful at this point to recall the main principles on which Wrede insisted and the arguments which were brought against his views.

Wrede rejected the widely accepted belief that Jesus claimed to be the Messiah during His Ministry, and was accepted as such by His disciples. It was not until after the Resurrection that His Messianic dignity was affirmed in the Christian community. Any impressions we gain to the contrary are due to the fact that the community, and Mark in his Gospel, accounted for the want of Messianic claims on the part of Jesus Himself by reading back into the gospel story the idea of a 'Messianic Secret.' In this way we must explain the many injunctions to secrecy in Mark. The daemons who seek to make Jesus known are silenced ($1^{23ff.\ 34}$ $3^{11f.}$ $5^{6f.}$ 9^{20}). Silence is commanded after notable miracles (1^{44} 5^{43} 7^{36} 8^{26}), after Peter's confession (8^{30}), and during the descent from the Mount of Transfiguration (9^{9}). Further, Jesus withdraws from the crowd on secret journeys (7^{24} 9^{30}) and gives private instruction to His disciples on 'the mystery of the kingdom of God' ($4^{10-13.\ 34}$), 'that which defiles' (7^{17-23}), exorcism and prayer ($9^{28f.}$), His Passion (8^{31} 9^{31} 10^{32-34}), and the Parousia ($13^{3ff.}$). All these features are interpretative and editorial. The intention is to explain why Jesus was not recognized as the Messiah during His earthly life.

The main points in the counter-arguments may be summarized as follows: (1) It was argued that it is in the highest degree improbable that Jesus would have been confessed as the Messiah after His resurrection unless it had been known that the claim was made, and was made by Jesus Himself, during the historic ministry. By itself resurrection did not carry with it a claim to Messianic dignity. (2) The Crucifixion, it was contended, is inexplicable unless Jesus was condemned as a Messianic pretender, and the inscription on the Cross shows this. (3) The first Christians would not have created the most formidable difficulties for themselves by preaching a Crucified Messiah unless Jesus had suffered as such. (4) Stories like the Messianic Entry and the Trial before Caiaphas imply that the question of Messiahship was a burning issue at the time, while Peter's confession, with its explicit assertion 'Thou art the Messiah,' shows that the Messiahship of Jesus was recognized by His disciples.[4]

Rarely has a critical hypothesis been subjected to such damaging criticism. All the more surprising, therefore, is the sequel. The citadel caved in; but the flag still flies. If, after nearly half a century, Wrede's theory continues to exert its influence, albeit in a drastically amended form, the explanation can only be that Wrede drew attention to important facts insufficiently explained by current criticism. It is apparent also that it is never enough to refute any one; we must build on the ruins of the rejected. The spectacle of Wrede *redivivus* in the most recent phases of Synoptic Criticism reveals the need for a constructive appreciation of the facts to which he drew attention. The presence of a 'Messianic Secret' in Mark is undeniable. If Wrede was mistaken, how do we explain the facts?

At this point the 'residuum of truth' recognized by Rawlinson [5] in Wrede's hypothesis gains a new interest. (1) Rawlinson observed that the repeated recognitions of the Messiahship of Jesus by the demoniacs represented a Markan theory about daemons and their supernatural knowledge. Doubtless this admission is justified, but the uncanny perceptions of mentally deranged persons are too well known to permit us to dismiss Mark's accounts as imaginary. (2) Rawlinson also suggested that Mark's representation of the disciples as spiritually blind sprang from a theory that their hearts were supernaturally 'hardened,' and that his 'somewhat exaggerated emphasis' on their persistent inability to understand was to be traced to this cause. This explanation had already been developed by Johannes Weiss,[6] and

[1] *Das Evangelium des Markus* [1937].

[2] *Das Evangelium nach Markus* [1937].

[3] I feel bound to express the conviction that Schniewind's hypothesis is considerably over-pressed. With what reason, for example, can we find the Messianic Secret in the fact that Jesus refers to the example of David in 2^{25}?

[4] Even Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, 67, who in general agrees with Wrede, says that 'Peter's Messianic confession must stand as historical,' although immediately he adds, 'But owing to the evangelist's tendency to paint the picture over, the answer of Jesus has been unfortunately lost to us.'

[5] *Op. cit.*, 260.

[6] *Das älteste Evangelium* [1903], 57–60.

it is supported by Mk 6^{52}: 'For they understood not concerning the loaves, *but their heart was hardened.*' Nevertheless, this explanation could not be, and Rawlinson did not claim that it was, more than a partial explanation of the facts concerning the Messianic secret. (3) More open to question was Rawlinson's admission that instances of private instruction given to the disciples ($4^{10-13.\ 34}$ 7^{17-23} $9^{28f.}$) might in some cases be a literary device by which Mark applied the teaching to the circumstances of the later Church. There can, I think, be little doubt that catechetical and doctrinal interests lie behind the selection and use of material in Mark. The narratives of the Miraculous Feeding (6^{35-44} 8^{1-9}) are possible examples. But the creation of situations is not in Mark's manner. In contrast with the later Gospels there are so many cases where he has refrained from devising or embellishing a narrative setting for sayings, that it is difficult to believe that his positive statements about conversations in houses and on roads are purely editorial, especially when incidents of the kind are a natural part of the intercourse of Jesus with His disciples. (4) Lastly, Rawlinson conceded that some of the injunctions to secrecy after notable miracles might be due to the overworking of the fact that Jesus did give such commands. Mk 5^{43} and 7^{36} are widely, although perhaps unnecessarily, believed to be instances of the kind.

It is clear that if historical research had concentrated less on refuting Wrede, and more on studying and elucidating the 'residuum of truth' in his bizarre contentions, greater progress might have been made in solving the Markan problem, and, what is more important, in developing its historical and theological implications.

III.

It must not be suggested that criticism had no alternative to Wrede's hypothesis. Hitherto, in reply to his contention, the injunctions to secrecy have been explained as actions of common prudence on the part of Jesus in the face of the Messianic excitement of the masses of the people. 'It is probable,' says Rawlinson,[1] 'that our Lord, as a matter of history, did not desire to attract men's attention primarily in the capacity of a wonder-worker.' Peake [2] puts the alternative more fully:

> 'He could not have proclaimed Himself as Messiah without evoking the popular enthusiasm which was in a very inflammable condition. Revolution against Rome might easily have broken out, and a life and death struggle might have been its inevitable sequel. In such a struggle Jesus could have had no share. His refusal to participate in it would have ruined all chance of winning the people for His cause; and disillusion, especially if attended by military defeat, would have embittered them against Him.'

So many New Testament scholars [3] have argued; and with justice. But, on reflection, this explanation, however just it may be to the facts of the historical situation, is far from being satisfactory. Its tendency, although not intended, is to represent Jesus as an astute statesman who balances pros and cons and decides, on the highest grounds, to avoid a course of action inimical to his best interests and those of the cause dear to his heart. The motive suggested is prudential. So Caesar might have reflected when planning to cross the Rubicon; so Alfred when scheming to resist the Danes; so John the Baptist before he girded himself and went forth to preach repentance in the wilderness. The motive reflects deep compassion for the people and a high sense of the dignity of a mission to Israel, but, spiritualize it as we may, it is perilously near the idea of playing for safety, and, in some of its presentations, akin to political dexterity. It can, of course, be stated in ways which avoid such suggestions, as in Rawlinson's words quoted above, but even so the emphasis necessarily rests on precluding misconceptions and on ensuring a desired end. Holtzmann's reference to the Argus-eyed Roman police keen to render Messianic movements innocuous in the speediest possible way, sufficiently reveals the humanistic possibilities of this type of explanation.

But if the motive was not prudential, of what kind was it? This question makes it imperative to ask whether the true nature of the Messianic Secret is revealed at all in Wrede's apparently exhaustive analysis. May not the facts to be explained lie much deeper than he supposed and be more vitally connected with Messiahship as Jesus understood it?

IV.

If we examine Mark's Gospel more closely, we see that the Messianic Secret is very much more than a matter of editorial activity. Commands of silence laid upon demoniacs, requests to keep miracles secret, references to withdrawals from public notice, and private instructions to

[1] *Op. cit.*, 261. [2] *Op. cit.*, 17.

[3] Cf. H. J. Holtzmann, *Die Synoptiker*, 10; Ed. Meyer, *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums*, ii. 451; M. Goguel, *Life of Jesus*, 372; J. Mackinnon, *The Historic Jesus*, 107; C. J. Cadoux, *The Historic Mission of Jesus*, 55 f.

disciples are some of its external features. The command not to disclose the teaching of Jesus concerning Messianic suffering takes us further, but the mystery lies deeper still. The secret is implicit in all that Jesus does. Far from being an editorial device imposed upon tradition, it is an integral part of the material itself. Dibelius's description of Mark as 'a book of secret epiphanies'[1] will not serve unless the stress lies on the adjective. An epiphany suggests something visible, but, if we are to use this word of Mark, we must think of an epiphany which is invisible save to the eye of faith and spiritual discernment.

To justify the statement just made it would be necessary to treat the entire Gospel. Here it must be sufficient to examine characteristic examples, and for this purpose I select the narratives of the Healing of the Paralytic, the Feeding of the Five Thousand, the Entry into Jerusalem, and the Question concerning David's Son.

In the Healing of the Paralytic (2^{1-12}) one point only need be treated, the use of the term 'Son of Man' in 2^{10}. He who would claim to have solved this *crux interpretum* is bold indeed. All that is asked here is whether new light is thrown upon the problem from the standpoint of the Messianic Secret. Some famous interpretations of this passage after much discussion are widely felt to be unsatisfactory. Only a rapidly diminishing band of exegetes now follows Wellhausen in his submission that the true rendering is: 'But that ye may know that *man* has power on earth to forgive sins.' The suggestion is utterly foreign to Jewish ideas and any beliefs which Jesus may be supposed to have entertained. Criticism has yet to try out the suggestion that in this passage the term *bar nasha* is collective, whether, that is to say, the authority is that of the Elect Community of which Jesus is Head; but it seems doubtful if this exegesis can ever be more than conjectural. Equally conjectural, and much more prosaic, is the claim that in the course of transmission a Messianic title has replaced the pronoun 'I.' But can Jesus have spoken of Himself as 'the Son of Man' on this occasion? In so speaking would His words have been understood? Was 'Son of Man' a recognized Messianic title? Criticism has long felt compelled to hesitate in affirming that Jesus spoke of Himself as the Son of Man in the presence of the scribes, and all the more since Matthew says that the crowds 'glorified God, who had given such authority to men' (9^{8}). But the position is completely altered if, despite the Book of Enoch, 'Son of Man' was not a recognized title, but, nevertheless, was used by Jesus as such, but with no intention on this occasion of publicly claiming to be the Messiah. Jesus speaks of Himself as He knows Himself to be, invested with authority to forgive sins on earth as the Son of Man, but the conviction is, and remains, His secret.

The Feeding of the Five Thousand (6^{35-44}) contains no reference to 'the Son of Man' or 'the Christ,' but by wide agreement the action of Jesus in breaking and dispensing bread and fish is felt to have Messianic significance. Jesus ministers to His disciples and the crowd as the Son of Man. Apart from the question of miracle, there is good reason to think of the meal as an anticipation of the Messianic Feast in the perfected Kingdom of God. This interpretation is not directly suggested by the narrative, except in the eucharistic language of 6^{41}, but the presence of tension, indicated by the action of Jesus in compelling His disciples to enter the boat and go before Him to Bethsaida (6^{45}), gives support to this view. A Messianic interpretation is also suggested by the later statement of Jn 6^{15}: 'Perceiving then that they were about to come and take him by force, to make him king, Jesus withdrew again to the hills by himself.' It is all the more remarkable, therefore, that the primary Markan narrative makes no reference to Messiahship and contains no Messianic titles. It is by no means improbable that when Mark wrote his Gospel the original meaning of the incident had been forgotten; but it may be that it was not perceived at the time and that, except by His action, Jesus did not indicate it. If so, the 'Messianic Secret' belongs to the incident itself. Jesus dramatized His claim for those who had eyes to see; He did not make it in word.

Similar features have long been noted in the narrative of the Entry (11^{1-11}). As Schweitzer has observed,[2] the Entry was Messianic for Jesus, but not Messianic for the people. Jesus consciously adopted the Messianic rôle suggested by Zec 9^{9} in a last attempt to reveal His dynamic conception of Messiahship, but the people hailed Him as a prophet and harbinger of the Kingdom of God (cf. Mk $11^{9f.}$, Mt 21^{11}).

In some respects the Question concerning David's Son (12^{35-37}) is the most enigmatic of the Markan narratives. The narrative element is negligible; everything depends on the interpretation of the question: 'David calls him Lord; so how is he his son?' (12^{37}). The suggestion that Jesus repudiated the Davidic descent of the Messiah and implied that He Himself was not a descendant of David has been fully discussed through several decades of Synoptic investigation.

[1] *From Tradition to Gospel*, 230.

[2] *Op. cit.*, 392.

It has been tried and it has failed. It is highly improbable that Jesus rejected a doctrine so deeply embedded in Old Testament teaching, and it is not likely that a tradition that He was 'of the seed of David according to the flesh' (Ro 1^3) could have gained currency so early and so widely if it had been known that He had rejected such a claim. Even more desperate is the attempt to trace the formation of the narrative to the original Christian community,[1] for in primitive Christianity the application of Ps 110^1 to Christ was made confidently and triumphantly, with no shadow of doubt or hesitation.[2] The section is credible only if it is original; it must go back to Jesus Himself.[3] This fact is of the greatest historical and doctrinal importance. It means that, without denying His descent from David, Jesus interpreted His Messiahship as supernatural, potential already and destined to be manifested. But He does not say this; He implies it.

The narratives treated above are only a selection, but they are sufficient to suggest that the idea of the Messianic Secret is not an editorial peculiarity, but that it is embedded in the tradition; it is the secret of Jesus Himself. Wrede's detailed study is the *reductio ad absurdum* of his own hypothesis; but failure in Synoptic Criticism is always invaluable to those who come later. Had British scholars preferred to use the building-line and the trowel greater progress might have been made, for with Germanic patience Wrede gathered for us the bricks and the mortar for a building better and more enduring than the critical shack he erected. Schniewind is justified in claiming that the features we have observed in a few narratives appear throughout because they belong to history.

It is possible that the note of reserve appears even at the high peak of the Gospel in the Trial Scene before Caiaphas. Apologists have been so anxious to claim the unambiguous 'I am' of Jesus in reply to the question: 'Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?' (Mk 14^{61}) that they have not paid sufficient attention to, or have passed over hurriedly, the form attested in Mt 26^{64}: 'Thou hast said: nevertheless I say unto you, Henceforth . . .,' and on Lk 22^{70}: 'Ye say that I am.' How did Matthew's version arise if he read the commonly accepted text of Mk 14^{62}? And was Luke following a special Passion source? It may be that the emphatic 'I am' is intentional. The time for silence is past; it is now the moment to speak! But the Matthaean text, not to speak of that of Luke, disturbs our confidence in this interpretation. Moreover, there is a variant reading in Mark: 'Thou hast said that I am.' This reading is attested by Θ fam.13 534 472^2 565 700 1071 geo arm and by Origen in his commentary on John.[4] On purely textual grounds we may justly hesitate to accept this Caesarean reading against the mass of authorities, but when it is supported by critical considerations and the Markan representation as a whole, the decision becomes another matter.[5] With what confidence can it be explained as a case of textual assimilation to Mt 26^{64} or Lk 22^{70}? What scribe, faced by a triumphant 'I am,' would prefer 'Thou hast said that I am'? No doubt, in fact, is expressed in the answer. The swift action of Caiaphas in rending his robe, and his cry: 'Why do we still need witnesses?' prove that he took the reply as a confession and a claim. And a claim it is, blasphemous if not true, for Jesus boldly asserts that the exalted language of Ps 110^1 and Dn 7^{13} will be fulfilled in His destiny. But there is still the strain of reserve manifest throughout the Gospel of Mark. And the same reserve is attested in the Fourth Gospel. Why was it necessary for the people of Jerusalem to say: 'How long dost thou hold us in suspense? If thou art the Christ, tell us plainly' (Jn 10^{24}). A criticism which attributes this dramatic representation to a flight of the Evangelist's imagination is puerile. But, if it is valid, it is determinative. Jesus held His Messianic claims in check. Messiahship was His secret.

V.

It is now necessary to answer the question: How are the facts of the Messianic Secret to be explained? The hypotheses of expediency and of editorial manipulation do not carry us far. Both are true, but they are of subordinate importance. The only answer that carries conviction is that the silence is grounded in the *nature* of Messiahship *as Jesus conceived it.*

To Jesus, Messiahship was not primarily a matter of *status* but of *action.* Had Messiahship been a question of status it could have been claimed in words, but, in fact, it is never claimed in words apart from deeds. Jesus is the Messiah in His works of healing and exorcisms, in His victory over Satanic powers, in suffering, dying, and rising again, and as coming in triumph with the clouds of heaven. When Peter declares,

[1] So Bultmann, *op. cit.*, 145 f; Bousset, *op. cit.*, 43; J. Weiss, *Die Schriften des N.T.*, i. 189; E. Klostermann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 144; B. H. Branscomb, *Moffatt N.T. Commentary: Mark*, 224 f.

[2] Cf. Ac 2^{34}, He 1^{13} 5^6 $7^{17.21}$; also Mk 14^{62} and parallels, 16^{19}, Ac 7^{56}, Ro 8^{34}, 1 Co 15^{25}, Eph 1^{20}, Col 3^1, He 1^3 8^1 $10^{12f.}$, 1 P 3^{22}, Rev 3^{21}.

[3] So Lohmeyer, *op. cit.*, 263; Schniewind, *op. cit.*, 154 f.

[4] *In Ioann.*, *t.* xxviiii.

[5] Cf. Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, 322.

'Thou art the Messiah' (8[29]), He charges the disciples that they should tell no man of Him (8[30]), and begins to teach that the Son of Man must suffer, be rejected, be killed, and rise again (8[31]). He is the Son of Man as He suffers, not the Son of Man who suffers. He will sit at the right hand of God, and thus will be seen as the Son of Man. He will come with clouds, thus manifesting Himself as the Messiah *in His triumph and in His reign*. Fundamentally, for Him Messiahship is not an office; it is a destiny. It is that which He does, that which the Father is pleased to accomplish in Him and which He fulfils in filial love.

Various adjectives have been used to describe this unique conception of Messiahship, but none of them is entirely satisfactory. Least adequate is the description 'Messiah-designate,' *Messias designatus* or *futurus*, for justice cannot be done to the Synoptic data until it is recognized that, in a true sense, during His Ministry Jesus is Messiah already, in His person, teaching, and works. How else shall we explain His reply to John the Baptist: 'Go your way, and tell John what things ye have seen and heard; the blind receive their sight, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, the poor have good tidings preached to them' (Lk 7[22] = Mt 11[4f.])? *Messias absconditus*[1] is a better term, but it is merely descriptive without explaining anything. *Messias passurus* adds part of the interpretation required, but it speaks neither of resurrection nor of triumph. The truth is we have no word in English or in Latin which, in itself, will embrace as a unity the ideas of present and future, now and not yet, here and hereafter. All that we can say is that the emphasis which Jesus laid on action implies that He both was, and was to be, the Messiah.

The clue to the 'Messianic Secret' is Jesus' own sense of His Messianic task. With that destiny unfulfilled, and to undiscerning minds, He could neither deny nor admit that He was the Messiah. He could not allow demoniacs to proclaim Him as such. He was compelled to enjoin silence after notable miracles. He could do no other when the three disciples descended with Him from the Mount of Transfiguration. He was obliged to leave the people of Jerusalem 'in suspense.' He was driven to say to the high priest: 'Thou sayest that I am: and ye shall see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of power, and coming with the clouds of heaven.' At cross purposes even with His friends, He had to await the fulfilment of His destiny. In truth the Messiah, He would not be the Messiah until His task was accomplished.

It is some confirmation of this view that the same duality of meaning runs through the sayings of Jesus about the Kingdom; it is both present and future, here and coming. So also His eschatological teaching is both 'realised' and climacteric. But the principal gain for purposes both of historical study and theology is the proof afforded that Christian thought has not been mistaken in affirming the unity of Christ's Person and Work. The two are one; in the Work the Person is seen; in the Person the Work is latent. Equally significant is the duality that has appeared in centuries of Christian experience, and appears still to-day. We ask who He is and He gives us no answer. Enigmatic as in the days of His flesh, He is enigmatic still to the questing mind. But He so works in history and life that, after He has left us 'in suspense,' we come to know of a surety who He is. He makes Himself known in His deeds, in the breaking of bread, in the Cross, in prayer and worship. He is what He does. His secret cannot be read; it must be found.

[1] Cf. C. K. Barrett, *The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition*, 119: 'Jesus was the Messiah; and if we are to qualify that title by an adjective it must be to call Him, not *Messias designatus* or *Messias futurus*, but *Messias passurus*, and *Messias absconditus*.'

The Parable of the Good Samaritan.

By Dr. John Bowman, Lecturer in Hebrew and Old Testament Studies, Leeds University.

That the Samaritans were Gerim,[1] Proselytes, was never denied by the Tannaim of the Mishnah, nor

[1] Sometimes in Mishnaic legislation the Samaritans are treated as being little better than Gentiles (cf. M. Ter. 3[9], M. Shek. 1[5]) or classed with Am ha-Aretz. (M. Dem. 3[4]). At other times they are treated in some religious matters as on a level with the Jew (cf. M. Ber. 7[1] for making up the minyan for Grace after meat; though one is not to say Amen till one has heard all the Grace he says). The Samaritans keep the Sabbath (M. Ned. 3[10]). Their Matzoth is valid for Jews to keep the Passover with. Cf. T. B. Hull. 4a, Kidd. 76a; though this point was disputed by some. Trade relations with them are envisaged as possible. Jews buy corn (M. Dem. 5[9]) and wine (M. Dem. 7[4]) from

the Amoraim of the Gemara. What was disputed was whether they were merely Proselytes because of the lions (2 K 17^{26}) or really true Proselytes. R. Ishmael held at the beginning of the second century that they were גירי אריות, but R. Akiba, his famous contemporary, thought they were גירי אמת and their priests valid (cf. T. B. Kidd. 75b). Because of their refusal to accept the Jerusalem Temple [1] or to come there (cf. M. Ned. 3^{10}), they obviously could not be regarded as on a level with orthodox Jews or even righteous Proselytes. On certain other scores they were suspect (cf. M. Niddah 7^{5}) and were not to be trusted,[2] yet the general feeling was that on matters where they kept the Law in the same way as the Jews, it was to be allowed that they were even more reliable than Jews; so Rabban Simeon ben Gamaliel II. (T. B. Hullin 4a; cf. also T. B. Ber. 47b). In T. B. Hullin 4a Rabbi Eliezer b. Hyrcanus dissented on the ground that they were not properly versed in the Law. But Eliezer belongs to a generation or two before Simeon Ben Gamaliel, and feeling against the Samaritans probably varied from age to age. If we can trust what R. Akiba (cf. M. Shebi. 8^{10}) implied was the attitude of R. Eliezer to the Samaritans, presumably in the first century A.D., feeling did run high against them; for Eliezer is typical of the older Pharisee. He is the traditionalist *par excellence*, who refused to change with the times, and held ever to what he had received from his teachers [3] (cf. M. Aboth 2^{8}). From what we know of R. Eliezer he would not have regarded them as Gerē Emeth, but nevertheless would have kept up the ancient libel that they were Gerē Arayoth.

The first and second commandments of Jesus (cf. Mk 12^{29-31}, Mt 22^{37-39}) become in Lk 10^{27} the lawyer's own answer to his question, 'What shall I do to inherit eternal life?' It is significant that Jesus in dealing with the lawyer refers him to the Law. Jesus is prepared to carry on the discussion within the framework of the Law. When the lawyer repeats the Shema' (Dt $6^{4.5}$) and Lv $19^{17\ (18)}$ as summing up the Law, Jesus commends his knowledge of the Law, and adds nothing to it, but the necessity for practising these commandments. Why then when the lawyer asks 'And who is my neighbour?,' Jesus tells us as in Luke the Parable of the Good Samaritan? One feels that if one remembers that the Samaritan was a Ger, or at least called a Ger Arayoth, we may have a strong clue. For in the very chapter of Leviticus where the Jew is told to love his neighbour (רֵעַ) as himself (Lv $19^{17\ (18)}$), he is also instructed that the Ger is to be treated like the native (אֶזְרָח); indeed the Israelite is to love the Ger as himself (Lv 19^{34}). Now by Re'a in this chapter of Leviticus, as indeed throughout H, the Jewish fellow-national or citizen is clearly meant. The 'Ezrah would at least be equivalent to the Re'a, if not even narrower in its term of reference. These two verses (17 (18) and 34) of Lv 19 ought to be taken together to give a complete and fair picture of a Jew's duties to his fellow-man.

If we remember that Jesus is most probably answering the lawyer on his own ground, and that the Samaritan was sneeringly termed in popular parlance Ger Arayoth, then Jesus in mentioning the Samaritan is reminding the lawyer of this later verse (*v.* 34) of the Israelite's duty to love the Ger, the Proselyte. The duty of love towards the Proselyte is probably what is in Jesus' mind; in H and in P the Ger is much more than sojourner, and has certain religious duties; it is taken for granted that he will worship Israel's God. So too in Mishnaic Hebrew the Ger is primarily the Proselyte.

But note in the story of the Good Samaritan, the Samaritan does not claim that he should be treated as a Re'a, a fellow citizen. Jesus with consummate artistry makes this Ger Arayoth take on himself the duties of a fellow Jew to the

them. They can mill corn for Jews (M. Dem. 3^{4}). The Samaritans were regarded as of doubtful stock (cf. M. Kidd. 4^{3}), and could not marry an Israelite. The Proselyte was here better off than the Samaritan as he, the former, could marry Levitic, Israelitic, and impaired priestly stock. M. Nidd. 4^{1} in ruling that daughters of Samaritans are menstruants from the cradle thereby rendered Samaritan men unclean and made social relations with Jews extremely difficult, not to mention intermarriage which would thus be impossible with Jews. It is true that M. Nidd. 4^{2} does not think Sadducean women any better than Samaritan in this respect. M. Nidd. 4^{1} would explain the Samaritan woman's startled retort to Jesus when He asked her for a drink of water (Jn 4^{9}: 'How is it that thou, being a Jew, askest drink of me, which am a woman of Samaria? for the Jews have no dealings with the Samaritans'). The last clause may be the Gospel writer's own comment, or reflect actual hard fact which the woman knew, and not merely the possible legal degree of intercourse allowed by the Mishnah.

[1] M. Ter. 3^{9} would allow that if a Samaritan gave Heave offerings or Tithes for the Jerusalem Temple [*sic*] they were valid. The same is allowed from a Gentile. M. Shekalim 1^{5} lays down that the shekel tax is not to be accepted from Gentile or Samaritan.

[2] Usually a Gentile's signature in testimony carried more weight than a Samaritan's, though a Samaritan's testimony and not a Gentile's is accepted for a writ of divorce or a writ of emancipation (cf. M. Gitt. 1^{5}).

[3] Often he evaded giving an answer, but if pressed would say, 'I have no tradition about this' (cf. T. B. Sukkah 28a; T. B. Yoma 66b; T. B. Ab. Zar. 17a; Tos. Yoma 4^{14}; Tos. Sukkah 1^{9}). With Akiba in the beginning of the second century the emphasis changed from tradition to hermeneutics as a way of discovering what the Law was or ought to be.

wounded Jew; which duties the priest and the Levite had refused, and passed by on the other side. 'Which now of these three, thinkest thou, was neighbour unto him that fell among the thieves?,' that is, really deserved the title of neighbour by doing the duty of a neighbour or fellow-citizen. The lawyer grudgingly admits, but without pronouncing the hated name Samaritan,[1] 'He that shewed mercy on him.' No more is said of the Samaritan, but the lawyer and those who heard Jesus would know that the Samaritan, the Ger, in taking on the duties of a fellow citizen to his neighbour, had thereby deserved at least to be treated as Lv 19^{34} enjoins, loved like the fellow national.

This interpretation may seem to contradict the generally accepted view that Jesus expanded Re'a in Lv $19^{17\,(18)}$ to mean anybody at all without reference to their Jewishness. Actually Re'a in the Old Testament itself could have a more general connotation, of friend or companion. But those who stress what appears to them the revolutionary expansion of the connotation of Lv $19^{17\,(18)}$ by Jesus, tend to do scant justice to Lv 19^{34} where already the duty of loving a non-Jew as oneself is laid down. If Jesus is extending anything, He is surely extending Lv 19^{34} where He would include the Samaritan, the Ger Arayoth, as one who deserves to be treated as the Homeborn, and loved as oneself. This, considering the hatred towards the Samaritan (cf. Jn 8^{48}), was a courageous thing to suggest.

Of course the fact that the Parable occurs only in Luke and not in the Marcan and Matthean versions of the incident, may mean that we should not stress as original the connexion between the Parable and the lawyer's questions which appear in Luke to have evoked it. But even if the Parable was not delivered in this connexion, and the setting is due only to the Gospel writer, the connexion though formal, between neighbour and Samaritan is probably to be seen in the commandment of Lv 19^{34} of loving the Ger as oneself, suggesting through association of Ger and Ger Arayoth, the Samaritan.[2]

[1] Cf. the periphrasis for Mt. Gerizim' in Jn 4^{20} probably from the pen of the Gospel writer, though put in that form in the Samaritan woman's mouth.

[2] In assuming that the Lucan account is here the more original in making the lawyer (and not Jesus as in Mark and Matthew) summarize the Law, one might claim the support of T. B. Shab. 31a where Hillel (fl. 30 B.C. to A.D. 10) loosely paraphrased Lv $19^{17(18)}$ in summarizing the Law for a would-be convert to Pharisaism: 'That which is hateful to thee do not do to thy Haber (companion or member of the Pharisaic Haburah).'

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

The Bundle of Life.

By the Reverend John W. Coutts, D.D.,
St. Fillans, Perthshire.

'The soul of my lord shall be bound in the bundle of life with the Lord thy God.'—1 S 25^{29}.

In the Bible life is called many things—a journey, a race, a fight. This is the only time it is called a bundle. That means, to begin with, that we cannot expect life to be too neat. You know the difference between a parcel and a bundle. A parcel is generally made up of things of the same sort—books or butter. If there are things of different sizes you arrange them neatly with the biggest below and the smallest on top, so that the parcel will come out a nice even shape. Then you tie it up with string, and, if it's a very particular parcel, seal it with sealing-wax; and off it goes by post or train looking very tidy.

But you don't expect a bundle to be as neat as that. It's got all sorts of things in it—different shapes and sizes, some of them nobbly and sticky-out. You have to be content if you can get them all safely wrapped up somehow, so that they will carry without things dropping out.

Have you ever seen an old tramp's bundle open at the roadside, when he is having a rest? There's an old pair of boots, horrid things to pack; and his clay pipe; and a wad of tobacco; a hunk of bread and cheese; sometimes a book, or a paper; and it's all tied up with a red handkerchief and can be slung over his shoulder on a stick, and carried easily all day. Not very neat, but it holds all he needs, and he brings everything safe to his journey's end.

You often have to make up a bundle like that when you go off for the holidays. The bags and boxes are all full. But lots of things have still to go in. So you make up a bundle of rugs, and in go your tooth-brush; your bat and ball; a poke of sweets; and that jolly book you are reading. It's not very neat, but it holds together with a strap, and the things get safely there, which is all that really matters.

Well! if life is a bundle it seems we can't expect to have it just as neat and tidy as some people would like to make it. I always suspect that when people make their lives too neat it's by leaving out some of the big things. God's world is orderly, with its summers and winters, its seed-times and harvests, but no one in his senses would dream of calling the world neat. It's too big and jolly for that; with its roaring winds and tossing seas;

with its millions of leaves coming down in the autumn, and its millions of fresh shoots coming up in the spring. It's a bundle all right; with all sorts of things in it—beautiful, and endearing, and surprising, and terrible. You won't make much of the world if you try to parcel it up and have it all taped off and begin to think you understand it, or (much more ridiculous) explain it.

Life's a bundle, like the world. There are all sorts of things in it. Laughter and tears, happy days and very dull and miserable days, making friends and falling out, the wonder of home, the pang of leaving it, the gladness of coming home again. I rather fancy that people who want to parcel it all out very neatly and make it all so tidy that everything is just as they want it, so that there is never anything surprising or amazing in it for them, have missed God's meaning and are making life much smaller than He meant it to be.

For the most splendid thing about the bundle of life is suggested in our text. It is that we can have God in it. We can be bound up in the bundle of life with the Lord our God. Life can't possibly be a small affair, then, can it? It can't possibly be ordered and smoothed out and arranged and tidied 'just so' according to our little notions of what is proper. There has to be room left for God to work in it.

And the Christian religion says—most amazingly—that God does so work. In Christ we have an Immanuel, a God with, and in us. He has come for ever into the bundle of our life in Jesus. If we leave room for Him it's bound to be a strange and unexpected bundle, with all sorts of amazing things in it. It may not be the tidy and neat thing we planned, with our small minds. But it will be far more interesting and exciting. And it can be glorious.

The Pace Maker.

By the Reverend Sidney Gray, B.A.,
Sudbury, Suffolk.

'In honour preferring one another.'—Ro 12^{10}.

Can you run? Have you ever won a race at the School sports? Was it the hundred yards? Or the four hundred and forty? If you are interested in either of these, perhaps you will know the names of two men who are rather famous just now for running these two races. They are both black men—West Indians—but they both ran in this country during the War and have stayed here since then.

Macdonald Bailey is the one who has run the hundred yards as fast as any one else in the world—in 9.6 seconds—and Arthur Wint can run the quarter-mile very fast indeed.

I was very interested a while ago to see that Wint was trying to break the record. This is how it appeared in my paper: 'Wint will try to lower the 440 yards record, standing to the joint credit of A. G. K. Brown and M. Lanzi. Brown will be among the well-known quarter-milers assisting Wint.'

I once saw Brown run. It was not in a race; he was practising on the track at Fenner's, while he was still a Cambridge undergraduate. I have never seen any one run with such beautiful ease; it made me realize what wonderful bodies God has given us; and I was not a bit surprised to see, later on, that Brown made a new record.

But now my newspaper told me that another man was trying to break Brown's record and—this is the wonderful part—Brown was going to help him to do it.

I expect you know that there is a trick in running a big race. It is not usually a good thing to be in front all the way. The man who runs too fast at the beginning uses up his strength, so that he cannot make a final dash. Another man just behind him, who has been nursing his strength, makes a spurt, passes him, and breaks the tape first. Sometimes there are men who will volunteer to be 'pace makers.' It is their job to run fast at the beginning, though they know very well that it will probably cost them the race. This, I suppose, is what Brown volunteered to do—to be a pace maker; to help another man to beat his record.

The end of the story is a wee bit disappointing, for when I looked at my paper again I found that Wint had not been able to run at all—he was ill on the day of the race; but that did not take anything away from the generous offer of A. G. K. Brown. It was a great day for him when he got the record, but this offer of his was far finer.

I think St. Paul would have liked Brown, for he was very interested in running; but he was still more interested that men should have the right spirit in their lives, and we have in our story a perfect example of St. Paul's saying, 'In honour preferring one another.'

We can go further and say that God would approve the spirit which Brown showed, for it is the spirit of our Lord Jesus Christ, who did not put Himself always first, or think of Himself first. 'He pleased not Himself, but made Himself of no reputation.' 'He came not to *be* served, but to serve.'

What about *our* actions to-day? It is a great thing if we ourselves can do wonderful things; but it is a finer thing when we are willing to forget ourselves and help others to do wonderful things.

The Christian Year.

Fifth Sunday in Lent.

The Elusiveness of God.

By the Reverend John R. Gray, B.D., Th.M.,
Glasgow.

'Canst thou by searching find out God? canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection?'—Job 11^{7}.

'No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him.'—Jn 1^{18}.

'Canst thou by searching find out God? canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection?' Since the beginning this question has taunted the mind and heart of man. At times the sneering

atheist has shouted it at the believer. 'Show me your God. How do you know that there is such a being?' In the great ages of faith, fearful men have whispered it one to another, in corners. In every age it has been a half question in the inmost souls of men—faithful and unfaithful alike. As man pondered the mystery of evil, the problem of suffering, the power of sin, or as he confronted great sorrow or loss in his own life, he has cried out in agony to God, and there has come to him from the blank immensities of space, like an echo, the question: 'Is there a God to whom I may cry, or is He just One, like the dream companion of an only child, whom I have imagined to lessen my loneliness?' 'Canst thou by searching find out God?' Is it possible to prove clearly and decisively, beyond any possible doubt, that there is a God who knows and cares? The answer is 'No.' The decline in belief in God in our own day is proof enough of that. Why is it so? Why has God chosen to hide from our seeking, to elude our certain grasp? Why has He not let us see Him so clearly that doubt was no longer possible? Three reasons may be suggested.

(1) Our minds are too little. The finite cannot contain the Infinite. There is only a limited range of sounds we may hear, and of colours we may see, and our little minds cannot be stretched to include the Almighty. If they could, then God would somehow be our inferior. We speak correctly enough of mastering a subject, of comprehending a problem. If we could, by searching, find out God, He would become, not the Lord God, but our subject, a problem which we had comprehended. The thing need only be stated to be seen as impossible. But, even if by some magic it could be done, the result would be unsatisfactory for—

(2) Our minds are not only too small, their processes are too unreliable and uncertain. If, by the exercise of reason, we could deduce God's existence, then His continued existence would depend for us on the soundness of our reason. The strength of a chain is its weakest link, and if a flaw were to be discovered in our thinking (and how many there are!)—one little slip in our logic, then our assurance of God at once would be gone. Too much depends—the whole of our life—on whether God is or is not for us to be content with One so insecurely based.

(3) Our minds are too little to find out God by searching, and they are too unreliable, and lastly, they are not suited for the search. The world may roughly be divided into things and people. The field of thought consists of things. About things we may find out whether they want to be found out about or not. We can force things to reveal their secret to the search of thought, but not so men. We cannot compel friendship or force a confidence. If we meet some one, and spend the time we have with them thinking about them, weighing and measuring them, investigating and examining them, we do not thereby get to know them better. The probability is that we'll never get to know them at all. We can get to know persons only by making ourselves as much subject to them as they are to us. We may get to know *about* people whether they will or no. We can only get to *know* them if they will—if there comes about that communion of eye with eye, of mind with mind, and heart with heart in which the meeting of persons consists. So it is with God. We cannot force Him to yield Himself to our searching thoughts. We can only bow before Him who is the Lord, and ask Him to give us that assurance of Himself we cannot attain. If God does not answer that prayer, if He does not reveal Himself to us, then all we are left with, at the best, for all our searching, is a handful of attributes or a collection of concepts. To prove the existence of a Master Mind, or of a Supreme Mathematician, of an X, an unknown quantity, a First Cause is of no possible use to us in the desperate struggle of life. These are but pale shadows left by the passing of the Living God, and are not enough to warm our souls or satisfy the hunger of our hearts. We cannot pray to a Master Mind, or worship a First Cause, or fly to the arms of an Unknown Quantity.

We may give thanks that the more man thinks, the more he is led to believe that there may be a God. We may rejoice that the best scholars and scientists, the men with the ablest brains and most acute minds and best training, have believed in God. We may gladly accept their assurance that belief in God is in no way inconsistent with the most advanced knowledge, the best science, and the most profound philosophy. But—and it is a great but—to go on from there to try and find out God to perfection by our own searching, is not only presumptuous folly, but actually disables us from truly meeting with Him. We shall come to know God only as He lets Himself be known, and so the full answer to the question in Job is found in John. 'No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him.'

(4) God has made us with a hunger for Himself, not so that by searching we shall find Him out, but because, from the beginning, He has willed to reveal Himself to us as a living, loving Person, and in Christ has fully done so. He denies Himself to our seeking of Him, only so that we may more fully respond to His seeking of us. He knows that our poor hearts crave for more knowledge, for greater certainty than our heads can give, and so willingly and freely He, in Christ, has given Himself to us—not to our strength but to our weakness, not to our cleverness but to our ignorance. God loves to show Himself—His Being—His Power—and His Love, not when they are best deserved, but when they are most wanted. That is the sort of God He is, as He has shown Himself to be in the life and death, and rising again of Jesus Christ, the Word made flesh, who dwelt among us that we might see His glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father. And, when we meet with Him, we give up the search to know *about* God. For in Christ we see the grace, the power, the love, the gentleness of God, fully and clearly shown. And then, we can do nought but fall to our knees in worship, and go forth to the life of love. The God and Father of

our Lord Jesus Christ is not one who is deduced, searched out and found. He is one who generously reveals Himself as the tender and forgiving Father of us all. We do not need to force His confidence, or storm the citadel of heaven. He condescends to show Himself, nay rather to give Himself to every humble, contrite soul.

'Canst thou by searching find out God? canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection?' 'No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him.'

PALM SUNDAY.

The Resurrection of the Christian Church.

BY THE REVEREND JOHN L. RIACH, B.D., EDINBURGH.

'Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone: but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit.'—Jn 12^{24}.

Some time ago a theologian posited the question, 'Would it have made any difference if Jesus Christ had never been crucified but had died in bed?' Suppose He had lived in Galilee, going about doing good, until His allotted span of threescore years and ten were finished, had then fallen ill and died a natural death, had been raised from the grave by God, had appeared to His disciples as in the Gospel narratives; would that have made any difference? In other words, would a resurrection of Jesus Christ without a crucifixion have altered things for men?

If Christ had risen from the dead after a natural death that would certainly have given needy mortals the assurance of immortality. It would likewise have convinced them of Christ's living presence with them in their everyday experience. But it would not have assured men of the one vital thing above all else they must know as a matter of life and death, and that is that God has supreme power to destroy evil in them and in the world despite its menacing appearances.

That is what the Master Himself saw. Some Greeks who had heard of His extraordinary teachings had come to Him, no doubt with the invitation to visit Greece. There He would find thoughtful people who would give Him a patient hearing and, free from intolerance, would probably allow Him to die in peace. Always thinking in pictures as He did, Jesus thought of the corn. Let a sower hold the seed in his hand and nothing comes of it; but let him cast it into the ground, cover it up, roll it in, compel it to die, and great results will follow. So, thought our Lord, must it be with Himself. If He were to reveal that God has power to do the most important thing of all for men, to destroy evil, He could not evade the Cross by venturing to Greece where He might die in peace. He must go to Jerusalem where evil men would crucify Him. Only such a resurrection would do. Here, then, is the great principle Easter has to teach us. There can be no proper, complete, vital resurrection of anything in the world without first a crucifixion.

The need of the hour is to look at this Easter principle with regard to one thing, the Christian Church. During the Middle Ages one of the devoutest of the Popes was watching a mule train, laden with treasure for the Pontifical coffers, enter the Vatican. As he stood on the steps there, a greedy cardinal leered and, rubbing his hands, said, 'Holy Father, no longer can the Church say "silver and gold have I none."' 'No,' replied the Pope sadly, 'and no longer can the Church say to an impotent man, "rise, take up thy bed and walk."'

That is how many thoughtful people who are concerned about the Church's well-being feel about the Body of Christ to-day. They know it possesses numbers and wealth, but they are sensible of a lack of the power, the vitality, the influence, the daring which characterized the Early Church. They confess it requires to be resurrected to new life. But of what avail are vague charges? We must be particular, and when we turn to Professor Whale he indicates that a living Church has three characteristics in the main.

(1) A living Church is *a believing Church*. In the Christian Church of our day there is both vagueness and uncertainty. So many believe a few of the central truths of the New Testament, they have reservations about others, and frankly, they do not believe some at all. But in a living Church there is a passionate belief in the whole gospel as revealed in the New Testament, or, as Quentin Hogg put it, in the Assembly Hall in 1946, in an impassioned utterance worthy of a theologian of standing, 'There is no such thing as world order without Christianity; and by Christianity I mean men who are not ashamed of standing on their feet to recite the Apostle's Creed, "I believe in God the Father Almighty, and in Jesus Christ . . .," every clause of it, with conviction.' To believe the whole gospel, all its chief tenets in the New Testament, like that, that is the primary mark of a living Church.

(2) A living Church is also *intensely missionary*. The position of Christianity abroad to-day is that one per cent. only of China is Christian, and two per cent. of India and Africa. Let the eye turn homewards and it sees that Christianity has been largely uprooted on the Continent, while in Scotland seventy-five per cent. of her sons are outside the Christian fellowship. A living Church cannot be indifferent towards such a world plight. It surveys the earth with the eyes of God. It sees that world issues literally depend on indifferent, pagan, and heathen men being won to the Faith they have either rejected or never known. No matter the difficulties and complications which the spread of Christianity entails, a true Church gives, prays, toils, and sends out missionaries in the Christian cause.

(3) And, third, a living Church is *a worshipping Church*. Already the younger Christian Churches in other lands are teaching us at home uncomfortable lessons. Recently, an Indian bishop complained because only ninety per cent. of his congregation went to church of a Sunday to worship God. Ninety per cent., forsooth, and we

congratulate ourselves if we get twenty per cent. these difficult days. In a living Church there is no callousness towards God like that. There is not only regularity of worship but an intensity of devotion which makes us forget ourselves altogether and be lost in the wonder, love, and praise of God for all He has done for us.

If such be the vital marks of a living Church, the crucial question remains, how can the Church we know be made to live in these ways? The Easter principle informs us that there can be no resurrection of the Church, absolutely none, without a bitter crucifixion. How can it ever become a believing Church until we crucify all faithlessness? Everything that poses as true evangelical faith, a nodding acquaintance with Christ, a casual interest in Him, a mere bare acknowledgment of His existence, must be shattered and in its stead put real faith, which is casting ourselves upon God in an act of complete trust. For God alone can reveal the truth of His own revelation to us and make us believe it, which He does through faith. How can the Church ever become militantly missionary unless we crucify that selfish spiritual individualism which makes us wish to save our own souls only and flatter ourselves that God will sit back quite content if we are saved when the whole creation is groaning for His deliverance? How can the Church ever become a worshipping Church until we all face up to our own natures, call things by their proper names and ask God to crucify each sordid sin? Ardent, regular worship of God cannot be artificially roused in men. It is the consequence of forgiveness at God's hand and nothing else, for, said Christ, 'to whom little is forgiven, the same loveth little.'

Chesterton, it is, who, in his graphic way pictures the Church rushing through the ages like a winged thunderbolt of everlasting enthusiasm. There have been periods in the past, the time of Paul, Luther, Wesley, Chalmers, when the Church throbbed with vitality, power, energy, and was gloriously alive. Do you honestly feel it is like that now? Or, are you chilled with the sense of its being moribund? Suppose the latter to be the unpleasant truth, the Church can rise from the dead and pulsate with new life, not if we have merely a sentimental hope, but if we allow God to crucify in you and me and all the Church the things which are killing it. For, here is the great principle of Easter. There can be no vital, complete resurrection of anything without first a crucifixion.

Easter Day.

The Victory and Its Cost.

By the Reverend John Baker, B.A., B.D., Batley, Yorks.

'Jesus came and stood in the midst, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you. And when he had said this, he shewed unto them his hands and his side.'—Jn $20^{19, 20}$ (R.V.).

In that terrible interval between the Crucifixion and the Resurrection the followers of Christ were in a strange position. While Jesus was alive they had seen such wonderful things happen, they had been so richly privileged, that the darkness of the Cross was far greater and more paralysing than we can imagine. It is one thing to *hope* that something grand will happen—it is quite another thing to have *seen* great things happen, and then to be cast into the darkness of despair. If these were to have their faith restored it could be done by nothing less than the most tremendous thing in the world, by an act not less wonderful than those they had seen when Jesus had been with them.

When a man has not had a deep religious experience, an ideal will satisfy him. It might be said that the heart-broken disciples could have comforted themselves by saying, Well, if our Lord is dead we still have His fine teaching, and a grand way of life, and we can carry on with the ideals He taught us.

But how could they be satisfied with teachings, after what they had seen, after believing that they had known a Redeemer who was the Son of God? It would have been hard on the disciples to have lost a great teacher or prophet or friend, but to lose One they thought was their Saviour, the Beloved of the Father, was a blow indeed. Their terrible disappointment was that they had lost the Lord who had come to set free the souls that were in bondage, and to redeem all who believed in Him. They had seen so much—only to see it vanish. We cannot imagine the darkness of those two days after the Crucifixion. If Jesus—of all men—were a failure, then was not all life but a farce and a mockery? How could they believe in His teaching if He had only been deceiving Himself after all, with His fine promises?

True, they held together as a company—held by the personal magnetism of Jesus. They might even have continued to meet for a few years if Jesus had died and left them, as other men die and leave their friends. But sooner or later there was one matter which was bound to appear on the agenda of their meetings—the question of winding up their society. They might have a reunion once a year after that, but they would not be a living, creative society.

That is what would have happened—but for one thing. But for one *fact*. It is always the *fact* that creates the new world. 'Jesus came and stood in the midst.' That was the fact. And everything changed. The fact of Christ's presence eliminated *every other fact*—no matter how real or distressing that might be. Man's very worst is destroyed, rubbed out, as it were, by the overwhelming fact of the Living Christ. In spite of man's evil and sin and cruelty He stands supreme—and real. Now the whole of life is created afresh, around a new centre, and that centre more secure than the universe itself.

It is this tremendous change that we feel in the atmosphere of the Upper Room when Christ appears. There has come into existence a new world, with new men and women in it because Christ is risen. 'If any man be in Christ, he is a new creation.' 'Where I was once blind I now

see.' Henceforth for these men and for a growing fellowship of Christians nothing in the world could gainsay the fact that Christ was alive, and that He had come to stay—with His continued benediction, 'Peace be unto you.'

Yet we must go one step further and face the whole picture. 'And when he had said this, he shewed them his hands and his side.' The Church's triumphant cry is 'Christ is alive.' But, say His hands and His side, He lives *because He died.* Simon Peter cried out eagerly, 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.' Yes, but 'Jesus began to teach them that the Son of man must suffer many things . . . and *be killed.*' It is so easy for us, too, to sing of the victory of Christ, and forget the agonised Cry of Dereliction on the Cross. Do we forget this side of the picture to-day in our discipleship? He showed them His hands and His side.

The Epistle to the Hebrews has a terrible accusation—'Ye have not yet resisted unto blood.' What does discipleship cost you and me? Many people have wondered in times of great personal or national suffering, or in great crises when evil seemed to be in the ascendant, whether God was pulling His weight, doing His share. Let them look at those nail-pierced hands and feet and then ask themselves, 'Are *we* pulling our weight?'

The disciples of Christ saw the challenge and met it. They knew what the victory had cost, and we know that they kept the faith—James by early death at Herod's hand, John probably by exile, Peter by suffering and death, and the others no less nobly.

We come before God to-day with the same knowledge of Christ's victory, and of its cost. Let us, too, keep the faith.

First Sunday after Easter.

What is There Left to Live For?

By the Reverend John Howat, B.D., Monifieth.

'Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which according to his abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, To an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for you.'—1 P 1[3, 4].

Quite recently I overheard a conversation between two old stalwarts who were bewailing the bleak outlook before the rising generation. Comparing what had been their inheritance when they began to make their way in the world with that of the youth of to-day, they felt rather sorry for those who were coming after them. Though they looked at the question from quite different angles, they reached the same melancholy conclusion. One of them was a staunch individualist. Brought up on the philosophy of the poor boy making good by his own grit and determination, he could only lament that the day of the pioneer and adventurer was past. The glittering prizes of life were no more and the future held out no hope at all for any would-be Andrew Carnegies. The other was an ardent radical with a passion for social reform. He had devoted his life to the building up of a better world and had lived long enough to see all his dreams shattered. The new world instead of being better was worse than the old. For both of them there seemed to be nothing left to live for, nothing that would give purpose and significance to life, nothing that would call forth the crusading spirit of youth and give them a cause to which they could dedicate their whole being.

(1) I think we must be prepared for widespread and growing disillusionment in the coming days. The old confident optimism, that has been behind the very real achievements of the last hundred years, is no longer possible for a generation that has seen the judgments of God abroad upon the earth, and the destruction of so much that their fathers held sacrosanct and bequeathed to them as an inheritance that would endure. From the Christian point of view that is not altogether to be deplored. For if the house we have been building has been reared on foundations of sand, and the rain has descended, and the floods have come, and the winds have blown and beaten upon it, and it has fallen; we at least know where we are.

It is one thing, however, to have our false hopes uprooted; it is quite another to lose hope altogether. And the danger is with the beautiful house we have inherited lying in ruins we may fall into despair. What is there left to live for?

Christian realism supplies the answer, that our true inheritance lies elsewhere. The message of Eastertide all down the ages has been that God has begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead. Out of the destruction and death of so many fair hopes at the Cross and the Tomb this new hope was born on Easter morning.

God comes to us now as always not in judgment only but with hope and promise, assuring us of an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away. If He has brought us low, it is in order to exalt us to the highest place. If He has permitted the destruction of much that was as precious to us as life itself, it is in order to turn our eyes to something infinitely more precious, this inheritance that fadeth not away.

(2) What is this inheritance? It is life itself, life rich, and full, and abundant, such life as men have only seen in Jesus Christ. In other words it is the real thing and not just the accidental accompaniments of life or any substitute for it dressed up in an attractive form. What the brave adventurer and the ardent social reformer have both been looking for, though in their search they have been carried away on a false trail only to be deceived. Why do men go hunting for glittering prizes, if it is not because they believe these prizes will ensure them a full life? Why do men try to reform the world, if it is not that all men everywhere may enjoy a full life? Both are looking for the same thing by a different route; and both have missed the route that will bring

them to their destination, through Jesus Christ who is the Life and also the Way. They got the husk and the trappings but not the thing itself. Money, position, property, universal suffrage, social security, the latest in health services—do any of these or all of them together ensure what the soul of man most craves for? You have only to ask anyone who has them, if he enjoys peace and contentment and self-mastery; in other words, if his heart is satisfied.

Christianity knows that it is life that men are looking for, and it is an inheritance of life that the Risen Christ has won for us. He, who had no wealth or property, no house of His own, no political rights, fought in the fight of life and overcame, and the fruits of His victory He has bequeathed to us. We are the inheritors of what He has won.

(3) In these coming days there will be greater need than ever for us to be clear about the nature of our Christian inheritance as we move about in a world that has lost its hope. We know that God has given us something that endures, that the changes of time and the catastrophes of history cannot destroy, that is incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away. Here is a prize that outshines all the glittering prizes that have captivated men and cruelly deceived them. Here is the only foundation of true community, which will bind men together in peace and love and prosperity. In a world of universal destruction the life that was in Christ, that triumphed over sin and suffering and death, alone remains indestructible.

Perhaps we are somewhat afraid of the phrase at the end, 'reserved in heaven for you.' Is this the old opium of not here but hereafter? You'll get pie in the sky when you die. To look at it in that light is to misunderstand the whole nature of the New Testament emphasis. The inheritance is not one that will be ours some day but is ours now. Christ is already dead and already risen. The fight has been fought and the victory won. Christ holds the trophies of victory in His hand now and offers them to us, so that even in this world of death and destruction we can share in His victory and enjoy the fruits of His triumph. As we allow Him who is alive for evermore to take possession of us, we can face everything in the strength of His grace and overcome.

The point about the hereafter is that even death, which robs men of so much, cannot deprive us of our inheritance in Christ. As the life of the Man of Nazareth could not be holden of death, no more can the life which He gives us which is His own. Through the portals of death we go to be where He now is, to know in all its fullness and perfection what we have tasted here. The glittering prizes of the world become tarnished and decay; the patterns of brotherhood for one generation become the oppressive tyrannies of the next. Both the adventurer and the reformer are in the end defeated by death, but not the Christian, who goes forward to a fuller and richer enjoyment of his inheritance in a world beyond the decay and destruction of time.

SECOND SUNDAY AFTER EASTER.

The Silence of God.

BY THE REVEREND GEORGE M. DOCHERTY, B.D., ABERDEEN.

'Unto thee will I cry, O Lord my rock; be not silent to me: lest, if thou be silent to me, I become like them that go down into the pit.'—Ps 28[1].

Of all the moments when a man may doubt his Maker and the goodness of things, surely the commonest is when, cast upon his knees by some burden too much for human shoulders to bear, he turns to God in fervent eager expectant prayer; but the heavens are as brass and nothing happens. As if, in Carlyle's phrase, God were an absentee God watching the world go by. Martin Luther conjuring up the Day of Judgment said he could bear anything except the silence of God. In that same mood the Psalmist cries: 'Be not thou silent to me, O Lord my rock . . .'

Why this silence of God?

But let us first be sure what we mean by silence. Is it but absence of sound, negative, meaningless? Some of the great moments in Mozart are those living dramatic silences more musical than many a cadence. Come down to breakfast any morning with never a word, and far from being meaningless, the whole family knows that something is brewing. Silence can be a devastating rebuke. And if this is true of human life, dare we suggest it as a truth in the Divine?

At least in three passages of the Gospels God does speak His Word in silence.

(1) Jesus before Pilate—a strange scene surely with one so weak and helpless, shackled, buffeted, scourged, humiliated before the impeccable Pilate and the pomp and power of Rome. And as Pilate hurls question after question, no word passes His lips. For this is the Silence of Judgment with the prisoner the Judge and Pilate the condemned. It is a Judgment that goes far beyond that courtroom—it is the very Judgment of Very God. For the Master in that silent look beholds beyond the face of Pilate the face of mankind. The unfeeling, blundering soldiers, who bruised and buffeted Him, and had their game, are you and I. Ours were the voices that joined with the mob's shout to 'Crucify Him.'

It might have been different. Jesus could have obliterated the world with a legion of angels, might have argued blazing words of truth against those who dare dispute His authority. But He stands still, calm and very quiet, and no word comes.

What if such be the answers to our prayers we thought were unanswered? Answering the sin in which we delighted with a disobedience that knew it all the time, however much we rationalize: our forgetfulness of the Father all creating; our concern about the things that make a noise, miscalled the practical, and a starvation ration of time for the realm of the spirit. And we are surprised that God does not speak! Not so very unlike Porphyria in Browning who strangled his sweetheart with the tresses of her hair and

sat the night through with the dead love on his shoulder.

> And thus we sit together now,
> And all night long we have not stirred,
> And yet God has not said a word!

It is the Silence of Judgment.

(2) Or it could be the Silence of Forgiveness—as when that foolish lad came back from the far country having spent the birthright he would have in time received as a gift. It is the son who speaks. 'Father I have sinned against heaven and in thy sight and am no more worthy to be called thy son . . .' One feels the silence of the scene in that father's embrace, unspoiled by any words as in every moment when the heart is full. And when he does speak, it is an order to the servants—'Bring forth the best robe.'

Nowhere has language less pith and power than in the phrase, 'I'm sorry.' Rather it is the new light in the eye, the firm grasp of the hand, the deep sense of peace and what we call 'unspeakable joy' that tell more eloquently than the music of the spheres the experience of forgiveness.

When they took the woman to Jesus, ('taken in the very act,' they said), He said not one word to her. But to her accusers, 'let him who is without sin cast the first stone,' then lost Himself in a reverie, writing on the sand. So also was it at the moment of the world's redemption. Out of the stillness of that great darkness that covered the Cross, silent and humid as before a storm when no bird sings, the true, deepest words that came were not those spoken by the Master lips, but the living Word that was to die, the Life that was conquering death.

Whatever the priest may say, God speaks His prayer of Absolution in Silence.

(3) There is also the Silence of Fellowship, of Kinship, of Love. Human fellowship is a wordy business, for if we cannot speak plainly and openly and secretly to intimate friends to whom can we lay bare the heart? There are times when conversation scintillates and ripples with laughter and banter and the heart is truly merry. But, again, there are moments when to speak would jar, when words can be raucous and obvious. Rupert Brooke tells of such a day when

> Safe in the magic of my woods,
> I lay, and watched the dying night,
> Faint in the pale high solitudes,
> And washed with rain and veiled by night.

How, suddenly,

> There was an uproar in my woods

and a voice gabbing and blethering trivialities spoiled it all.

May this not be true of Divine Fellowship?

Something of this must have happened to those two disciples on that dreadful first Easter Day (dreadful to their pre-Resurrection consciousness) when, wanting to get away from Jerusalem with its pall of death and wild rumours, they were met on the journey by a Wayfarer with whom they spoke until 'they tired the sun with talking and sent him down the sky.' But the deeper fellowship with that Stranger of the Way came in the silence of that moment when He broke the bread. And is not that moment for us too, when the scales drop from the eyes, as the distribution of the elements silently proceeds at the hands of reverent elders in our Scottish Kirk in the Communion Service, and God speaks not in the wind, nor earthquake, but in a still small voice that is wordless?

One is, indeed, far ben when one can say with the peasant who daily went to his prayers in the wayside church, and was asked how he prayed, 'I just look at Him and He looks at me,' he said. This is to brood upon God, without embarrassment if words do not come; nor fears if there be no answering voice; nor troubled restlessness because time seems long; but all is calm and still and the Peace and Presence of God, so silent and sure, breaks through the din and turmoil of our lives. One touches His garment and knows a Living Fellowship.

The Primitive Form of Christian Baptism.

By the Reverend H. V. Martin, M.A., B.D., Ph.D., Anantapur, South India.

It is now fairly generally accepted that the normal mode of Christian baptism in the New Testament Church was that of complete immersion in water. But the further question has to be asked as to the circumstances under which the rite was performed, and in particular as to whether it was performed by an agent or self-administered. To answer this question, we must go back in the first place to a study of the Johannine rite of baptism.

John's baptism was almost certainly one of immersion in the Jordan. But in what form was his rite received? It is generally assumed that the baptism was performed by John himself as the agent. Two main arguments are used in this connexion.

(1) The plain statement of our Synoptic records (Mk 1^5 *passim*). But we have come to realize in these days that the Synoptic records have often been adjusted by the writers in the light of ideas

and customs prevalent in the Church situation at the time of writing. Therefore, even the plain statements of the Gospels are not always to be taken at their face value on matters of fact. A suggestion that, in this matter of John himself being the actual agent of an administered baptism, the records may unintentionally be misleading us, is to be found in the variant reading in the Western Text of Lk 3^{7}, *i.e.*, ἐνώπιον αὐτόυ instead of ὑπ' αὐτοῦ. This by itself would not carry any great weight, but it is supported by other evidence that the Johannine baptism was a self-administered one, though in his presence.

(2) The title given in the records to John, *i.e.*, ὁ βαπτιστὴς, the Baptizer, and by the use of the present participle form ὁ βαπτίζων (Mk 1^{4} *passim*). But on the point of language, this also is not conclusive. Just as σοφιστης may mean 'one who makes men wise,' so βαπτιστὴς may mean 'one who makes men baptized' or 'the bather.'

But the main argument against the conception that John was the actual agent in his baptism, comes from the close parallel of the Jewish 'Tebilah' baptism customary in connexion with the admission of proselytes to Judaism. That there were many such converts in the time of Jesus is clearly shown by Josephus (*Ant.* XIII. ix. 1, XIII. xi. 3, XVIII. iii. 5). Jesus Himself speaks of the proselytizing zeal of the scribes and Pharisees (Mt 23^{15}); and we know from Roman writers such as Horace, Tacitus and Juvenal, that both at that time and later, many Gentiles were entering Judaism.

Three things were required of a convert, namely, circumcision, baptism, and sacrifice. We are concerned here only with the second. In the Babylonian Talmud we have a clear account of this rite. After circumcision, the candidate was led to a bath (Tebilah) with a capacity of at least 120 gallons. While he stood in the water, 'two learned men stand over him and teach him a few light and a few grave commandments, and when he has bathed (טבל) and has come up, he is like an Israelite in every respect.' On ascending out of the bath, the convert uttered his benediction: 'Blessed art thou who has sanctified us by thy Commandment and commandest us concerning "tebilah."'

By this baptism, the convert is ceremonially cleansed from the religious defilement of his non-Jewish origin and life. That such Gentile defilement was very realistically conceived and keenly felt by Jews, is clear from passages in Ezra, Daniel, and the Apocrypha. The words 'Gentile' and 'sinner' (in the sense of religious defilement) were practically synonymous in the mind of the Jew (cf. Gal 2^{5}). Our point, however, is that in this Tebilah baptism, there is no administration by an agent. It is self-administered in the presence of witnesses. In the case of women converts, even the two elders have to stand outside. The form of baptism is in line with all other Jewish ritual ablutions in that they are all self-administered and never performed by an agent.

It has been argued by some scholars, however, that the Jewish Tebilah ceremony may only have started after the time of Christ. Generally speaking, however, though there is no direct contemporary evidence, the general consensus of scholarly opinion is that it was started some good time before the birth of Christ. The earliest written evidence for it is to be found in Epictetus in the latter half of the first century A.D. The Palestinian Talmud also mentions it in connexion with the conversion of some Roman soldiers to Judaism which almost certainly must have taken place before A.D. 70. The Sybilline Oracles, usually dated A.D. 80 or later, has the significant phrase: 'Wash your whole bodies in ever-running rivers.' The Babylonian Talmud, which we have already quoted and which deals with the Tebilah ceremony in detail, is usually dated in the second century A.D. But in all these authorities there is nothing to suggest that this rite was of recent origin, and everything to suggest the opposite. Moreover, the Jews were extremely unlikely to have instituted after the rise of Christianity a baptismal rite of their own which would have confused them even more seriously in the eyes of the Roman Government with their Christian rivals. After A.D. 70 the importance of the Tebilah ceremony would probably have increased since, when sacrifice was no longer possible, the Tebilah ceremony would be the only initiatory rite left for women who formed the majority of converts to Judaism.

That there is a close connecting link between the Johannine baptism and the Jewish Tebilah rite, at least in form, has to be admitted. The meaning and purpose of the rite were different, since whilst the Tebilah was only for Gentiles, the Johannine baptism was only for Jews. But the link is there in that John's baptism meant that the repentant Jew would be thereby cleansed from his sin and would be numbered in the Righteous Remnant which would alone escape on the imminent Day of the Lord and enter into the coming Kingdom of Blessing. Not every Jew by birth would be saved, but only those marked by the new initiatory rite of the baptism of repentance.

Did the Johannine baptism follow the form of the Tebilah, especially on the point of self-administration? On general grounds there is every likelihood that this was so, and this is supported by linguistic evidence. The Greek

word βαπτιζω with its cognates is a very rare one in pre-New Testament writings. In addition to its literal sense, it could be used metaphorically as in Plato and Josephus. In the Septuagint it is only found four times :

(1) of Naaman dipping himself in the Jordan seven times at the command of Elisha (2 K 5^{14}).
(2) of Judith performing her ritual washing at the fountain (Jth 12^{7}).
(3) of cleansing after ritual pollutions (Sir 34^{25}).
(4) metaphorically in the sense of being immersed in fear (Is 21^{4}).

In the New Testament, the word βαπτιζω with its cognates is found seventy-seven times, nearly half of which are in connexion with the Johannine baptism. Being the intensive and iterative form of the Greek βαπτω, it comes to mean in general 'to immerse,' though in the case of Lk 11^{38} (washing before dinner) and Mk 7^{4} (washing pots and cups) there may be a slightly different meaning. It could also be used figuratively (Mk $10^{38.\ 39}$).

In all three cases where the word is used in the Septuagint of actual water purification, we find that it indicates self-administration. This is particularly striking in the case of Naaman where not even Elisha is present. On this basis, and on the grounds of certain linguistic evidence in the New Testament, Burton Scott Easton presents a strong case for an original form of Christian baptism as a self-administered rite (*American Journal of Theology*, xxiv. [1920], 513–8). In this he is supported by H. G. Marsh in his more recent scholarly exposition of the whole theme of early Christian baptism. (*The Origin and Significance of New Testament Baptism.*)

Easton points firstly to three cases where βαπτιζειν is used in the middle or reflexive voice in dealing with water baptism (Mk 7^{4}, Ac 22^{16}, 1 Co 10^{2}). Other Greek words also connected with baptismal practice are likewise used in the middle voice, *i.e.*, ἀπόλουσαι (Ac 22^{16}) ; ἀπελούσασθε (1 Co 6^{11}) ; λελουσμένοι (He 10^{22}) ; and νιψασθαι (Jn 13^{10}). In three other cases, all in Luke's Gospel, the middle of βαπτιζω appears as a variant reading. Of these numerous passages, three call for special attention.

(1) Ac 22^{16}, *i.e.*, the description by Paul of his baptism where Ananias says : ἀναστὰς βαπτισαι καὶ ἀπόλουσαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας σου ἐπικαλεσάμενος τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ. Easton points out that the phrasing here is entirely Talmudic, and is closely paralleled by descriptions of the Jewish Tebilah experience. The 'calling upon his name' by the Christian convert is the equivalent of the Tebilah benediction uttered by the new convert to Judaism. The words of Ananias must therefore be translated : 'Arise, baptize thyself and wash away thy sins, calling upon His name.'

(2) 1 Co 6^{11}, ἀλλὰ ἀπελούσασθε, ἀλλὰ ἡγιάσθητε. We are reminded here of the use of the same tense and voice used in the Sybilline Oracles already mentioned. ἐν ποταμοῖς λουσασθε ὅλονδεμας ἀενάοισιν, 'Wash your whole bodies in ever-flowing streams.' Also we have to note the Septuagint rendering of Is 1^{16}, λουσασθε καθαροὶ γέγεσθε. 'Wash yourselves clean' (Moffatt). So here also Paul's words must be translated, as indeed Moffatt does translate them : 'You washed yourselves clean' and the reference is undoubtedly to the experience of Christian baptism.

(3) 1 Co 10^{2}, πάντες εἰς τὸν Μωϋσην ἐβαπτίσαντο ἐν τῇ νεφέλη και ἐν τῇ Θαλάσσῃ. Here also Paul has Christian baptism in mind, even to the parallel form 'into Moses' for 'into Christ.' In the same way in the following verse Paul has in mind the Lord's Supper when he speaks of 'spiritual meat and drink.' Though some important manuscripts have the passive form here — ἐβαπτίσθησαν, Easton shows that the middle form is undoubtedly the correct reading. The whole sentence in *vv.* $^{1-4}$ is phrased in the active tense : 'All lived under the cloud, all crossed through the sea, all baptized themselves into Moses . . . all ate the same supernatural food and all drank the same supernatural drink.' The crossing of the Red Sea was certainly not a passive experience.

Easton agrees with A. Merx (*Die Vier kanonischen Evangelien*, ii. 41, no. 1) that βαπτίξειν must mean 'to bring or induce to baptism' or 'to hold a baptism,' corresponding to the Hiphil form of טבל. Tabal itself must then correspond to the middle form βαπτίζεσθαι and mean 'to immerse oneself.' The passive form βαπτίσθῆναι corresponds to the Hophal הטבל with the meaning 'to be brought or induced to baptism.' The middle form found in the variant readings in Luke (3^{7} 7^{30}) must therefore be taken in the sense that the people were immersed in water by their own act in the presence of the Baptist as the inducer and witness.

A Jew, even though he spoke Greek, would always be conscious of this usage of βαπτίζω in the active sense, *i.e.*, Φιλιππος αὐτόν ἐβάπτισεν (Ac 8^{38}) would mean to the Jew that Philip acted as the witness and exhorter at the rite in which the eunuch baptized himself. But Greek readers (*i.e.*, non-Jews) would miss this meaning and would naturally take it in line with the initiations of the mystery religions, that Philip acted as the agent in administering the water-immersion.

Easton sums up thus : 'It is clear that the New Testament preserves traces of a baptismal practice which differs liturgically from that found later'

(*op. cit.*, 516). Marsh after close examination of the evidence agrees that the primitive Christian form of baptism was one of self-administration. He says: 'These arguments offer strong support to the contention that the original forms of both Johannine and early Christian baptisms were similar to, and derived from, the Jewish Tebilah . . . the whole seems to present a cumulative force which compels recognition of the true origin of the first Christian sacrament' (*op. cit.*, 81).

That the change over of the baptismal form from one of self-immersion in the presence of a witness or elder to one of passive immersion by an agent, was taking place by the middle of the first century A.D. is not denied. Even the causes operating in the change may be suggested. In general, it was part of the change which inevitably took place as Christianity moved from Jewish to Greek soil. In particular, it was helped by the difference of language interpretation from Aramaic to the Greek *Koine*. This change of baptismal form would also be helped by the parallel forms of initiation in the mystery religions where the ceremony is definitely performed by a priest and the neophyte is passive. It has also been suggested that it may also have been furthered by the assimilation of the theory of baptism to that of exorcism. By baptism, it would be understood that the convert was being 'exorcised,' *i.e.*, delivered from slavery to evil powers of the spirit world. The post-baptismal invocation by the convert would then gradually be replaced by the exorcism prayer and benediction of the officiating minister or elder.

There is thus a strong case for the claim that the primitive form of Christian baptism was that of self-administration, and that this changed gradually to a ceremony in which the convert was passive and the rite became an administered one. To what extent the change of form altered the conception of baptism is a larger question, to go into which no attempt is made here. But even James Moffatt, one of the foremost New Testament Greek scholars of this last generation, agrees that the primitive form was one of self-administration. 'Most Christians seem to have baptized themselves as Paul himself had done' (Commentary on *First Corinthians*).

I am convinced that a study of Christian records of the first few centuries would reveal supporting evidence that this practice and idea of self-baptism lingered on for quite a time. I need only refer by way of example to 'The Acts of Paul and Thecla.' In the story of Thecla's persecution in the arena of Pisidian Antioch, after other forms of executing her had failed, a large tank filled with seals was brought. But she cast herself willingly into the water, crying: 'In the name of Jesus Christ do I baptize myself on the last day.' Later when she met Paul, she tells him: 'I have received the washing, O Paul, for he that hath worked together with thee in the Gospel, hath worked with me also in my baptizing.'

It would seem also that this practice of self-baptism has not died out altogether even to this day. Travellers in Palestine have given accounts of the Russian Church pilgrims to the Holy Land baptizing themselves in the Jordan near Jericho. I conclude by quoting one such account, by Gertrude Bell in a letter dated at Jericho, 17th January 1900:

'I rode off . . . and went down to the Jordan. There we found an enormous crowd assembled . . . Greek priests and Russian peasants . . . some in their white shrouds which were to serve as bathing dresses in the holy stream and then to be carried home and treasured up till their owner's death. . . . The sun was very hot, and we waited and waited while those who were going to be baptized signed their names and paid a small fee. . . . We waited for about half an hour, then the crowd opened and a long procession of priests came to the water's edge with lighted candles. The shrouded people clambered down the mud banks and stood waist deep in the stream until the moment when the priests laid the cross three times upon the water, then suddenly with a great firing off of guns every one proceeded to baptize himself by dipping and rolling over in the water. It was the strangest sight' (*The Letters of Gertrude Bell*, 61).

Apart from the guns, have we not here a clear picture of the form of primitive Christian baptism?

Recent Foreign Theology.

Nouvelle Revue Théologique. The first issue of the sixty-ninth volume of this monthly journal, published by the Jesuits of Louvain, contains articles on 'The Spirit and the Desire for God,' by L. Malevez; on 'Generation and Love,' by Dr. R. Biot; on 'Belgian Protestantism,' by L. G. Dantinne; and review articles and short notices on a large number of publications. The article on Belgian Protestants is a short objective survey of their varieties, strength and positions, written to promote understanding and unity. By this is not meant reunion, for the author recognizes that to many reunion means absorption, for which none are prepared. He aims rather to persuade his Catholic readers to capture something of the spirit which animates their separated brethren, and to persuade the latter that he desires the better to understand them in order to love them the better. The spirit which pervades the article is of the highest, and while he recognizes quite frankly the doctrinal and other differences that separate Catholic and Protestant, and that distinguish the various Protestant groups, he recognizes the non-Catholic churches as Christian, yielding a sincere and loyal devotion to Christ.

Theologische Zeitschrift. The post-war Swiss journal, published bi-monthly and now in its third year, continues to serve its readers with some excellent articles. The first two issues of this third volume are now to hand, and amongst other articles they contain the following: 'The Historical Significance of the Jewish Direction to be faced in Prayer,' by E. Peterson; 'Clement of Alexandria's Doctrine of Perfection in its Historical Setting,' by W. Völker; 'Luther and the Reformation in Contemporary Swedish Theology,' by H. Lindroth of Upsala; a Memorial Oration on 'Johannes Wendland,' by K. Barth; 'Ugaritic Problems and their Bearing on the Old Testament,' by W. Baumgartner (a paper read in Cardiff at the International Meeting of the Society for Old Testament Study); 'Does the New Testament know the Idea of Purgatory?', by H. Bietenhard; and 'The Self-Criticism of Lutheranism,' by E. Wolf. To indicate the purport of all these articles is impossible by reason of space. The last will probably attract most attention from many readers. It was written by a German and read to a German audience, and it offers a real contribution to the understanding of the contemporary situation, and particularly on the question of the relation of Church and State. In addition to these major articles there are brief notes on philological and textual points and extended book reviews.

The Theological Foundation of Law. In the Swiss series of studies published under the title 'Cahiers Théologiques de l'Actualité Protestante' an important monograph on the Theological Foundation of Law has appeared.[1] In it the author, J. Ellul, examines the concepts of Natural Law and Divine Law, and the relations between Law, State, and Church. The argument throughout is closely reasoned, and its essential contention is that the only ultimately valid foundation for law is the will of God. Man's rights are his not because they are founded in Nature, or conceded by the State, but because they are prescribed by God and reaffirmed by Christ, and the denial of those rights is a breach of the ultimate Law. In the chapter on 'Law, State, Church,' he charges Karl Barth with implicitly sharing the Fascist view that the State is the decider of justice, in contrast to the clear Biblical teaching that the State itself is under Law. The author claims that the Church has an absolute and fundamental right to the liberty to proclaim the gospel, with all its implications in the social and political realms. On the other hand, the Church has no right to control the State. The State is a servant, but not a servant of the Church. Both are the Servants of God, who is the ultimate source of all their rights, and on their obedience to the law of God and on this alone their well-being and survival depend.

The Sources of Joshua 13–19. The distinguished Norwegian Professor S. Mowinckel has published a short examination of 'The Question of the Documentary Sources in Joshua 13–19.'[2] Here he examines and rejects the views of Alt and Noth, and maintains that these chapters are of post-exilic origin and were composed by the author of the Priestly Code on the basis of tradition. Apart from the author's acquaintance with Jg 1, he denies that he used any written sources. The twelve tribe system is held to be no older than the time of David, a ten tribe system having been recognized in the age of the Judges. Mowinckel notes the difference in character between the lists found in these chapters and those which are known from archæological sources, and especially finds the attitude to Ephraim and Manasseh to reveal the hand of a writer who regarded them both as belonging to the schismatic Samaritans. The study is marked by acuteness and learning, and has good documentation in the notes which are collected at the end.

H. H. Rowley.

Manchester.

---

[1] *Le Fondement théologique du Droit* [No. 15–16 of the series (1946)]. Delachaux & Niestlé, Neuchâtel; Fr. 4.25.

[2] *Zur Frage nach dokumentarischen Quellen in Josua* 13–19 [1947] (but dated on cover 1946). Dybwad, Oslo; Kr. 3.00.

Contributions and Comments.

The Imperatival Participle.

In The Expository Times, May 1947 (p. 207 f.), Dr. H. G. Meecham discussed the imperatival use of the absolute participle, a question recently raised afresh by Dr. D. Daube in his Appended Note to Dr. E. G. Selwyn's Commentary on 1 Peter. Dr. Meecham brought forward two new papyrus passages in support of the view, rejected by Dr. Daube, that the N.T. usage (which in some passages at least is unquestionable) has an adequate background in Hellenistic Greek. It does not, however, appear that his quotations invalidate Dr. Daube's argument. They may be briefly examined.

P. Fay. 109 : [10] καὶ νῦν παρακληθεὶς νομίσας ὅτι κιχρᾶς μοι
[11] [αὐτοὺς] μὴ κατάσχῃς Κλέωνα κτλ.

Pisais, the writer of the letter, is repeating a request made a few lines earlier—his need is evidently urgent, for this request is really the only theme of his short note. It will be well to quote the earlier lines (2–6) :

[2] καὶ νῦν
[3] παρακληθεὶς τοὺς τρεῖς στατῆρες οὓς εἴρηκέ
[4] σοι Σέλευκος δῶναί μοι ἤδη δὸς Κλέωνι, νομί-
[5] σας ὅτι κιχρᾶς μοι αὐτούς, ἐάν σε δ<έ>ῃ τὸ εἱμάτιόν
[6] σου θεῖναι ἐνέχυρον.

Here νομίσας is certainly not imperative (as Dr. Meecham believes it to be in l. 10), but is constructed with δός. In the same way in (l. 10 it is constructed with κατάσχῃς. παρακληθείς, as frequently in the papyri, means 'please,' and the sentence runs, 'And now, please, having borne in mind the fact that it is (in view of my generosity on other occasions—see l. 2) only a loan you are making, don't keep Cleon waiting,' etc. Of course it is better English to say, 'Please bear in mind . . . and don't . . .' but this has nothing to do with the construction in Greek. This sentence therefore falls out of consideration.

P. Amh. ii. 39[16ff.] : ἐν οἷς ἂν οὖν ὑμῶν προσδέωνται, ἀντιλαμβανόμενοι καὶ ὑμῖν δὲ γράφοντας, ὑπὲρ ὧν αἱρεῖσθε, ὡς πᾶν προθυμότερον τελεωθησόμενον, ἐπιμελόμενοι δὲ καὶ ἑαυτῶν ἵν' ὑγιαίνητε, ἔρρωσθε.

I have been unable to find these words among the Amherst Papyri, but I note that they are quoted by Mayser [1] (*Grammatik der griechischen Papyri*, II. i. 196, note 3) as from Grenfell, I. 30[6]. We find here three participles, ἀντιλαμβανόμενοι, γράφοντας (γράφοντες lgd.), ἐπιμελόμενοι. Of these the last may certainly be constructed with ἔρρωσθε ; and the καὶ ὑμῖν (ἡμῖν lgd.), καὶ ἑαυτῶν seem to bind all three together and so to link them with the final imperative, which will therefore suffice to give them their imperative sense.

[1] Omitting ὑπὲρ ὧν αἱρεῖσθε ὡς πᾶν προθυμότερον τελεωθησόμενον.

It is unnecessary to go over again the two papyri cited by Dr. Meecham from Moulton, but it is important to observe that both citations are derived from the ends of letters, and can therefore prove at best very little about general Greek usage. Evidently it was both possible and fashionable to expand the concluding formula of a letter with more or less conventional phrases which were commonly thrown into participial form, and of which ἐπιμελόμενοι ἵν' ὑγιαίνητε (or the like) was certainly one.[2] *P. Tebt.* 59 (cited by Dr. Meecham) is a good instance of this ; it is similar to the now rather old-fashioned English, 'Yours to command,' which also was capable of almost unlimited expansion and modification.

Mayser, who rejects (*op. cit.*, 196 note 3, 340 f.) Moulton's view, provides stronger evidence for it than its supporters. It is important to note his quotations, and the reasons why he rejects them as grounds for believing in a regular use of the imperatival participle. 'The difficult passage (*Petr.* II. 19 (1a) 1 ff.) runs : ἀξιῶ σε μετὰ δεήσεως καὶ ἱκετείας οὕνεκα τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ καλῶς ἔχοντος δοὺς τὰ πιστὰ Μηζάκωι μηθέν με εἰρηκέναι σοι καθ' αὐτοῦ (=κατ' αὐτοῦ) μηδέποτε ἄτοπον . . . . καὶ ὡς ἂν τοῦτο ποιήσηις, ἀξιώσας αὐτὸν μεταπέμψασθαί με καὶ διέσθαι ἀπὸ τῆς φυλακῆς ; that is, I urgently request you, give to M. assurances that I have never told you anything improper against him . . . and when you have done that, ask him to send for me and release me from the prison. Moulton himself admits the possibility of anacoluthon. Clearly the writer wavers between ἀξιῶ σε and an expression common in such cases, as καλῶς ποιήσεις or χαριεῖ μοι=be so good as, do me the kindness of, which would properly be followed by a participle. *Hib.* 78[6] . . . may be similarly dismissed : ἔτι οὖν καὶ νῦν ἐπιμελές σοι ἔστω ἀπολύειν αὐτοὺς τῆς νῦν εἰς Ἀλαβάστρων πόλιν λειτουργίας διὰ τὸ μὴ ἐκπεσεῖν αὐτοῖς τὸ νῦν λειτουργῆσαι καὶ ἐὰν ἐκ τοῦ Ὀξυρυγχίτου ἐπιλέγωνται, Ζωίλον ἀπολύσας. We expect an imperative . . . or the infinitive . . . ; instead, however, a participle is connected, by anacoluthon, with ἐπιμελὲς ἔστω, as though it had been preceded by ἐπιμέλου, while the interrupting καί has been introduced between the governing verb and the subordinate participle. . . . *Hal.* 7[2] falls into the same category : ἀποδοὺς οὖν (sc. τὴν ἐπιστολήν) καὶ ὡς ἂν Ἀπολλώνιον ἐξαποστείλῃς πρὸς ἡμᾶς, διασάφησον ἡμῖν παραχρῆμα=deliver (the letter), and when you send A. to us inform us immediately. ἀποδούς has no independent force as an imperative (Keineswegs hat ἀποδούς die selbständige Bedeutung eines Imperativ). . . .' (*op. cit.*, 340 f). The great importance of these examples is that they

[2] In all seven epistles Ignatius expands the final greeting ἔρρωσθε. In *Mag.* 15 it is expanded with a participle, and in *Trall.* 13[2] with a participle to which ἔρρωσθε gives an imperatival sense : ἔρρωσθε ἐν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ, ὑποτασσόμενοι τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ. This participle, of course, recalls 1 P 2[18].

are not mere epistolary formulæ ; nevertheless, as Mayser shows, they cannot prove an established Hellenistic usage. His stress on anacoluthon as an explanation is entirely justified. No one who has read through Mayser's pages on the anacoluthic use of the participle will find it difficult to ascribe the few possible cases of the imperatival participle to this cause.

It must, of course, be observed that Dr. Daube's argument does not stand or fall with such considerations as are presented here. As he shows (p. 470), 'Even if the evidence from the papyri were valid in itself, it would yet be inapplicable to the cases from the New Testament that it is sought to explain.' Moreover, even if the examples from Greek usage were far better than they are, those drawn by Dr. Daube from Hebrew would be a hundred times better still. The construction in question can be produced at best in a few Greek papyrus letters, which are certainly exceptional ; but in the Mishnah it is regular. There is no evading so striking a fact.

One positive contribution may be added to this criticism. Perhaps the longest list of imperatival participles *and adjectives* occurs in Polycarp, *Ep. ad Phil.*, 4–6. The passage is too long to quote here, and a full discussion would require a separate article.[1] In 4^2 the participles begin in the feminine accusative plural ; they refer to τὰς γυναῖκας ὑμῶν and might be said to depend upon some such word as διδάξατε, to be understood (cf. διδάξωμεν ἑαυτούς in 4^1). In 5 and 6 the participles and adjectives continue, mainly in the masculine nominative plural, with occasional parenthetical notes (as 5^{3b}). These insertions seem for the most part to be borrowed from various N.T. documents ; the imperatival participles are directed towards wives and widows (4), διάκονοι and νεώτεροι (5), and πρεσβύτεροι (6). This is very important, for it shows that in Polycarp also, as in the N.T., this curious usage was employed in community rules. For this and other reasons it is much to be desired that Dr. Selwyn's researches into primitive Christian catechetical material should be pursued into the writings of the Apostolic Fathers.

C. K. BARRETT.

Durham.

The Marcan Parable of the Child in the Midst.

UNDER this heading Dr. M. Black points out (THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, lix. [October 1947] 14) that in the passage Mk 9^{33-37} the same Aramaic word '*talya*' lies behind 'minister' ($v.^{35}$) and 'child' ($v.^{37}$). It is possible to use this point in a way different from that which he suggests.

There is good ground for regarding this passage as a record of two incidents, not one. The former ($v.^{33-35}$) is concerned with the question, 'Who is the greatest ?' and our Lord's answer : 'If any man would be first, he shall be last of all, and minister of all' ($v.^{35}$). The second ($v.^{36-37}$) is concerned with 'Jesus and the children' ; there is no mention of the earlier dispute on greatness. If we could forget the parallels in Matthew and Luke, this would be more obvious. Wellhausen in his commentary on Mark points out that $v.^{36-37}$ is a separate whole and is not closely connected with $v.^{33-34}$.

It has long been thought that the closing verses of Mk 9 consist of a catena of quotations without any historical connexion and linked together by single words. Thus 'salt' is the link between $v.^{49}$ and $v.^{50}$; 'fire' between $v.^{48}$ and $v.^{49}$. The word 'scandal' connects $v.^{43-47}$ with $v.^{42}$; and $v.^{38ff.}$ is linked with $v.^{37}$ by the phrases 'in thy name,' 'in my name.' If this principle can be carried back still further to $v.^{33ff.}$, the mnemonic link between $v.^{33-35}$ and $v.^{36-37}$ is the word '*talya*,' the two passages being joined by the same device as the remaining part of the chapter. Dr. Black has provided us with a valuable clue to the way these two passages may have become associated, evidently at the Aramaic stage of the tradition.

Rawlinson appears to treat $v.^{33-37}$ as a unity, but he nevertheless includes among the purely verbal connecting links found in $v.^{33-50}$ the following : 'the idea of being minister of all ($v.^{35}$) recalls that of receiving little ones ($v.^{37}$).' This point would be much stronger if the same word originally occurred in both sayings, and this is what Dr. Black now enables us to maintain.

It is rather remarkable that Matthew and Luke both omit Mk 9^{35} and pass from $v.^{34}$ to $v.^{36}$, making the child an object lesson. That they should give the disciples' dispute and omit our Lord's explicit reply is strange. One explanation is the suggestion that in the copies of Mark which they used the reply of Jesus was missing. It is absent from D, d and k ; and the evidence of Tatian supports the view that this omission was an early textual mistake. (Tatian gives Mk 9^{33-34} ; he omits $v.^{35}$; he then passes to the incident of the Temple Tax from Mt 17 ; and later comes Mt $18^{1ff.}$) This and a number of other examples were set out under the heading, 'Did Matthew and Luke use a "Western" Text of Mark ?' in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, lv. [April, 1944] 180. The use of the word 'Western' was explained as implying no more than that some early variant readings of the Marcan text which perhaps lay before Matthew and Luke appear later in the Western tradition. This was put forward merely as a suggestion, and although a number of further examples have since come to my notice, I still regard it as no more than a possibility. In the present instance, however, it would explain Matthew and Luke's handling of the Marcan material. If something like the D reading lay before them, they had no choice but to take the action of Jesus, in placing a child in the midst, as His answer to the dispute.

T. F. GLASSON.

Windsor.

[1] It brings out clearly the nature of the problem : in profane Greek, a very few examples, due probably to careless writing ; in a much smaller body of Christian Greek, a quite considerable number. Some explanation such as Dr. Daube's is needed to account for this strange contrast.

DR. BLACK's article in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES (October 1947) throws much illumination on the Marcan Parable of the Child in the Midst, especially in the suggestion to which he leads up that τὸ παιδίον τοῦτο may have been the boy-servant of the household at Capernaum. But I am not satisfied either that Mark's arrangement of the logion in 9^{33-37} is erratic, or that Dr. Black has interpreted the real point of the story. Nor need the fact in 9^{35a} 'where Jesus "called" His disciples in the middle of a conversation with them' (to quote Dr. Black) be a difficulty.

It is manifest that both Matthew and Luke have cut the Marcan story down in its details. Matthew has, as Dr. Black points out, made an apparently more logical account, but the introduction shows that Matthew's interest is not in the incident as fact but as a peg for a dominical ruling on true greatness. The disciples actually put the question to Jesus; psychologically how improbable! Luke is less prosaic, but he cuts out the apparent non-essentials and remodels the story to put the moral 'appropriately at the end.' On the principle analogous to '*difficilior lectio potior*' we might reconsider whether Mark may not be right after all in his arrangement.

First, reconstruct the scene as Mark faithfully reproduced it from Petrine reminiscence—all the more vivid for not being forced into a logical mould. The disciples had bickered by the way, and as they enter into the house Jesus asks the question. They remain silent, and try to slink away to some task or other to escape so searching a question. Jesus enters the house and sits down and calls the disciples back; He will not let them escape the issue. (One cannot say with Dr. Black that it was 'in the middle of a conversation': the disciples had evaded conversation on so searching a matter.) He then puts to them His own revolutionary principle of greatness; it is to be found in the service of others. To press His point home He calls the servant-boy of the household, and *by His own act* He demonstrates the reversal of values. He, the master, honours and 'receives' the servant-boy. He who thus acts in receiving such a servant-boy is in very deed receiving God.

Secondly with regard to the interpretation: the dramatized parable does not turn on the child as a symbol of humility (real children are not all that humble!), but on the act of a master receiving a servant. It is a dramatized parable of the same order as the washing of the disciples' feet. There is thus no *non sequitur*. We may add that the inability to recognize a straightforward *sequitur* where one is manifestly present arises from reading into this passage Matthew's conflation of another saying (Mt $18^{3.4}$) concerning the qualifications for entry into the Kingdom, which is not the point at issue. (Note that it is only Matthew who introduces the reference to the Kingdom of Heaven in the introduction to the story.)

There is one verbal difficulty in our interpretation: that Jesus' final saying in $v.^{37a}$ is to the effect that in performing an action such as He has performed the disciples will be receiving Him. Jesus, it may be said, in receiving the child could hardly have been receiving Himself! This difficulty is, however, purely verbal, and it arises from an attempt to make a parable fit an exactly proportionate logical mould. There are not a few of Jesus' parables where the exact logical proportions cannot be pressed.

Apart from this difficulty, the vivid freshness and psychological naturalness of Mark's narrative so stands out that before venturing on an interpretation which requires re-arrangement of the narrative, it is surely better to get the feel of the incident and then read the interpretation in its own light, and not in the light of a Matthaean conflation or of the different story of Mk $10^{13ff.}$

E. L. WENGER.

Baptist Mission,
Barisal, East Bengal.

Entre Nous.

A Jesuit Poet.

In *Gerard Manley Hopkins: A Life* (John Lane; 10s. 6d.) Eleanor Ruggles has produced a fascinating book. Apart altogether from the absorbing interest of her subject Miss Ruggles is herself a master of words. Again and again she coins vivid phrases which tell a story in a brace of words. So, for instance, of the Rev. John Bradley Dyne, D.D., Hopkins' headmaster, she writes: 'His persuasiveness lay in invective. His logic was a flogging.' She speaks of Carlyle, 'fuming in Chelsea, the victim of his bad digestion and his good sense'; of the undergraduates of Oxford moulded like 'clay under Newman's nervous fingers and Pusey's relentless fists'; of the decline of the Oxford Movement into 'a perpetual swoon of mediævalism and bogus contrition'; of Newman binding his eyes 'from further searching with the bandage of a final creed'; of Miss Rossetti 'as she sat bolt upright, unsmiling and often quite solitary in the midst of a frivolous gathering like a brown mute nightingale surrounded by peacocks.' There is more than verbal dexterity, there is flashing insight in such compendious phrases.

Gerard Manley Hopkins was a singularly unhappy personality. He had in his nature elements of conflict which set the stage for tragedy. There was in him a certain intensity. Even as a child 'he wept easily and each time with desperation.' 'The word "unconditionally" is the clue to every decision made by Hopkins.' It is doubtful if ever in a lifetime of sustained endeavour he felt able to say, 'I have done my utmost.' With that intensity there was a certain futility in him. His life was littered with 'fragmentary ventures' and 'brilliant tangents.' 'Though I finish nothing I am not idle,' he wrote when he was at Oxford, and it was true of him all his life. Later in life he projects some literary undertaking and says, 'I suppose like everything else of mine it will come to nothing in the end.' The inevitable result of this intensity coupled with futility was a kind of agonised frustration.

Thou art indeed just, Lord, if I contend
With thee; but, sir, so what I plead is just.
Why do sinners' ways prosper? and why must
Disappointment all I endeavour end?

Wert thou my enemy, O thou my friend,
How wouldst thou worse, I wonder, than thou dost
Defeat, thwart me? Oh, the sots and thralls of lust
Do in spare hours more thrive than I that spend,
Sir, life upon Thy cause.

Birds build—but not I build; no, but strain,
Time's eunuch, and not breed one work that wakes.

It is always to be remembered that he felt it to be incompatible with his Jesuit vows to publish poetry under his name. Very few of his poems were published during his lifetime and we owe them to the loving care of Robert Bridges, his friend.

As a poet Gerard Manley Hopkins is an enigma. He could write with complete and lyrical lucidity.

Oh! till thou givest that sense beyond,
To show thee that thou art, and near,
Let patience with her chastening wand
Dispel the doubt and dry the tear;
And lead me child-like by the hand,
If still in darkness, not in fear.

But far more often his verse is so obscure that even his closest friends, in despair of understanding it, asked for a 'crib' from himself. If genius, as some one has said, be characterized by an appearance of ease in performance and production, then Hopkins was no genius for there never was a poet whose works give a greater impression of labour. In *The Habit of Perfection* he exalts the ascetic ideal in which the senses are deflected from the spiritual world to the absolute service of the spiritual.

Elected Silence, sing to me
And beat upon my whorlèd ear,
Pipe me to pastures still and be
The music that I care to hear.

Shape nothing, lips; be lovely-dumb;
It is the shut, the curfew sent
From there where all surrenders come
Which only makes you eloquent.

Be shellèd eyes, with double dark
And find the uncreated light . . .
O feel-of-primrose hands, O feet
That want the yield of plushy sward,
But you shall walk the golden street
And you unhouse and house the Lord.

Deliberately he uses all kinds of new techniques. He uses 'sprung rhythm,' which means that lines must be scanned by accents or stresses alone, without any account of the number of syllables. He revived the Homeric device of tmesis. He allows himself omissions and forms of expression which are scarcely to be termed English at all. And yet he can write sometimes with a rare beauty. In *The Windhover*, called by himself 'the best thing I ever wrote' and dedicated to 'Christ the Lord' he describes the falcon's flight:

I caught this morning morning's minion, kingdom
of daylight's dauphin, dapple-dawn-drawn
Falcon, in his riding
Of the rolling level underneath him steady air,
and striding,
High there, how he rung upon the rein of a
wimpling wing
In his ecstasy! then off, off forth on a swing,
As a skate's heel sweeps smooth on a bow-bend;
the hurl and gliding
Rebuffed the big wind. My heart in hiding
Stirred for a bird,—the achieve, the mastery of
the thing!

And in the end he finds in Christ that all the frustrations and the limitations are set at naught:

Flesh fade, and mortal trash
Fall to the residuary worm; world's wildfire,
leave but ash:
In a flash, at a trumpet crash,
I am all at once what Christ is, since he was what
I am, and
This Jack, joke, poor potsherd, patch, matchwood,
immortal diamond
Is immortal diamond.

Miss Ruggles' book is rendered doubly useful by an admirable bibliography and index. This is a rich book which must send many to a study of a singularly intense soul and a poet, who, in spite of all his obscurities, had the flame of genius in him.

WILLIAM BARCLAY.

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

READ AT HOME
for a London University
B.A. or B.D. DEGREE

In your leisure hours you do a certain amount of serious reading. But is this reading haphazard or is it *planned*? Has it a *definite objective*? Why not read with a view to crowning your efforts with a B.A. or B.D. Degree? Quite apart from other (and perhaps more material) advantages, the work of preparation will widen your outlook and keep you abreast with modern studies.

In recent years many Ministers have taken Degrees by reading at home in their leisure hours under the experienced guidance of Wolsey Hall tutors.

LONDON B.D.: HEBREW NO LONGER COMPULSORY
Under the latest Regulations candidates may now obtain a *Pass* at B.D. without offering Hebrew, but this subject is still compulsory for those seeking Honours. If you are interested please mention this when writing for Prospectus.

Open to all

You need not go into residence or attend any lectures. All that is necessary is to pass three exams., Matriculation (or, if you are over 23, the *shorter* Special Entrance —see below), Intermediate, and Final; you may read for these at home without interfering with your pastoral work.

Special Entrance Examination

Anyone over 23 who intends to read for a London Degree may take the Special Entrance Exam. instead of Matriculation. Only four subjects need be presented, and these may generally be chosen from among those to be taken for the higher exams. Mathematics is not compulsory. Over 1,300 Wolsey Hall Students have passed this examination.

Wolsey Hall Postal Courses

for the above examinations are prepared and individually conducted by a staff of more than 80 University Graduate Tutors. These Courses comprise Lessons, Test Papers, Model Answers, correction of your work and solution of *all* difficulties by your tutors. A Guarantee is given that in case of failure, tuition will be continued *free*.

Write (mentioning examination or Degree) for Prospectus, post free from C. D. Parker, M.A., LL.D., Director of Studies, Dept. GE 20,

Wolsey Hall, Oxford

Distinctive Printing
WILL ALWAYS APPEAL!

We shall be pleased to submit suggestions for your
PRINTING and PUBLICITY REQUIREMENTS

Write for particulars now to

MORRISON & GIBB Ltd.
PRINTERS • • *BOOKBINDERS*
TANFIELD, EDINBURGH

W. & A. K. JOHNSTON Ltd.
LITHOGRAPHERS • *MAP PRINTERS*
EDINA WORKS, EASTER ROAD, EDINBURGH

CROSS AND ALTAR
The Rev. Professor H. MAURICE RELTON, D.D.
Fellow and Professor of Theology in King's College, and Professor of Biblical and Historical Theology in the University of London, Vicar of All Saints', Ennismore Gardens, Knightsbridge.

Foreword by Canon E. S. ABBOTT, Dean of King's College.

This brilliant and original exposition of the meaning and function of the Church and the sacraments in relation to the Atonement, and these in turn to the Christian Life in the World, is written in a clear, concise and non-technical language. 8/6 net

A PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION
EDGAR SHEFFIELD BRIGHTMAN

Edgar Sheffield Brightman, Professor of Philosophy Boston University, has written a most learned and admirable survey of the whole field of religious experiences which, apart from being of great interest to the average reader, is essentially a book for students of Theology and students of Philosophy reading for degrees or diplomas. Demy 8vo. 18/- net

THEY SHINE LIKE STARS
A HISTORY OF THE ANGLO-CATHOLIC MOVEMENT
Rev. DESMOND MORSE-BOYCOTT
Author of "Great Crimes of the Bible," "Ten Years in a London Slum," etc.

This magnificently illustrated volume, dealing with the Centenary of the historic Secession of John Newman from the Anglican Church to the Church of Rome, in the autumn of 1845, has led the Rev. Desmond Morse-Boycott to write a history of the Anglo-Catholic Movement to date.

24 illustrations. 21/- net

From all Booksellers or direct

SKEFFINGTON & SON LTD.
55 PONT STREET, LONDON, S.W.1

Publishing in March

A NEW BOOK
BY A FAMOUS AUTHOR

WHERE THE NEW WORLD BEGINS

by

James REID, D.D.

This selection is made from the fine articles Dr. Reid has written during the past five years developing this idea in his own eloquent and constructive fashion. One great fundamental Christian thesis underlies this book: that any kind of new world must, in the last resort, depend on the kind of men and women we are. Only the grace of God can give us the qualities we need to build and to maintain it.

7s. 6d. net

The Publishers are

HODDER AND STOUGHTON

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. *Registered for Transmission by Canadian Magazine Post. Entered as Second-Class Matter 15th March 1929, at the Post Office, Boston, Mass., U.S.A.*

PUBLISHERS—T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET, EDINBURGH, 2. *Annual Subscription, including postage, 16s. 6d. net.*

AGENTS—WILLIAM DAWSON & SONS LTD., LONDON, E.C.4. CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, NEW YORK, U.S.A.

ADVERTISING DEPARTMENT—KING'S GATE ABERDEEN. *Rates—£7, 7s. per page; smaller spaces pro rata. 'Copy' to be received not later than the 6th of the previous month.*